40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "Good morning, Members. Members shall be in their chair. We shall be led in prayer today by Imam Hassan Aly who is the Imam and Director of Religious Affairs at the Mecca Center in Willowbrook. He is representing Council of Islamic Organization of Greater Chicago. Imam Hassan Aly is the guest of Representative Jones. Members and guests shall... are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Imam Hassan Aly."

Imam Hassan Aly: "[Recited in Arabic]. And peace be with all of you. In the name of God, the most gracious, the most merciful. [Recited in Arabic]. All you who believe, stand out firmly for God as just witnesses and let not the enmity and hatred of others make you avoid justice. Be just that is nearer to piety. Our Lord, for everybody in this meeting and all who serve within our state and our nation, give them all the insight to promote righteousness, the things that will honor all of us. Let them experience the joy of sacrifice, respect, and honor that comes from their services. Bring a spirit of unity to our House. Let wisdom and integrity reign in every leader's life. Keep their goals simple. Birthing ideas or laws that will keep our state safe. Protect the weak, heal the broken, and encourage every person to his full potential. Protect them and their families. Give every leader a strong their destiny. And remind them responsibility, not only to the ones they serve but always to you, Lord. Open our eyes to your perspective for decision making, to foster peace, fairness, and justice for all. Amen."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Speaker Willis: "Thank you, Imam. We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Moylan."
- Moylan et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Willis: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Harris is recognized to report any excused absences from the Democratic side of the aisle."
- Harris: "Madam Speaker, let the record reflect that Representatives Moeller and Costello are excused today."
- Speaker Willis: "Thank you. Representative Butler is recognized to report any excused absences from the Republican side of the aisle."
- Butler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representatives Bennett and Brady are excused today."
- Speaker Willis: "Thank you. Have all recorded themselves who wish? Clerk, please take the record. There being 114 present... Members answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Thank you. On the Order of Agreed Resolutions we have House Resolution 186, offered by Representative McSweeney. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 186. Be it
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn the passing of Deputy Jacob Keltner and extend our sincere condolences to his family, friends, fellow officers, and all who knew and loved him."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "Representative McSweeney is recognized on the Resolution."

McSweenev: "Madam Speaker, we're here to honor a hero Jake Keltner. A man who, in the line of duty, was killed and taken away from his family while he was protecting us. I want to start off by thanking everyone here today for honoring this great man. I want to thank the Speaker for his graciousness today. The Governor of the State of Illinois for his graciousness to the family. I want to start off by introducing this family. The person that I met for the first time this morning that I've certainly followed very closely, her words that are so eloquent and her love for her husband, Becki Keltner is here. She's here with her two sons, we have Caleb and we have Carson. We have Jake's father Howard and mother Helen. And his father-in-law Donald Cranston. So, if we as a Body can please give recognition to this family for their service, I'd like to start there and thank you for all of your service. And after that I'd like to say a few more words. But if we could give them a round of applause, I'd appreciate it. As I thought about what I was going to say today, I couldn't come up with anything better than a letter that Becki wrote to the public after this tragedy happened. With her permission I'm going to read the letter because it is probably one of the most eloquent things that I've ever read. And it shows the love, and it shows the courage, and it shows the commitment. So I'm going to read Becki's letter with her permission. And I'm going to start now. 'I am writing this letter because my husband, Jacob Keltner, should be remembered not as another statistic, but as a man, a great

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

man, who sacrificed his life to protect others. Jake is the love of my life. We met at Western Illinois University in January 2004 and were inseparable. We married in 2007, and soon after, I got a teaching job and we both focused on our careers doing what we love. In 2012, we were overjoyed to add Caleb, who is going to be president someday... and then I attest to that after seeing this morning... to our family. And then Carson, my fiery redhead, blessed us in 2014. Jake and I agreed that I would leave teaching to dedicate all of my time to raise our boys, and it has been the best time of my life and our marriage. We loved each other fiercely. He was a tough quy, but a secret sweetheart. He surprised me with the best gifts, nights out, and heartfelt notes. He would do things he hated with me like seeing a ballet because he knew how much I loved it. He supported every endeavor I ever took on and was there for me every second when my mom recently passed away. I was so lucky to have found a love so good and a man worth spending my life with. He was a die-hard Cubs fan with me, and we almost died watching the 2016 World Series together. He loved adventure. He would try anything, bungee jumping, ziplining, whitewater rafting, and more with a huge smile on his face. Some of those he made the things to do with the family, and he would hold my hand the whole time. He was brave, and he made me braver. My husband was a 'cop's cop'. He loved everything about his job and looked forward to going to work every day. He was a true patriot who wanted to protect the people of this country, so I knew when he was selected for a position in the U.S. Marshal's Fugitive Task Force, I couldn't have stopped him from taking the job if I

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

tried. I knew it was dangerous, but he was smart, strong, and great at what he did. I knew he would protect his fellow officers like he protected our family. Then I received the one phone call every police officer's wife has nightmares about, only this time the nightmare was real. Now I find myself a 33-year-old widow, mother of two young boys who no longer have their daddy. If feels unreal. It's unfair. I have screamed. I have cried. Nothing can make this better. He was an amazing dad. He always found ways to have fun with the boys. The night before he died, he was teaching them how to catch and throw to get ready for little league. He built forts and set up family movie nights and boy's nights with the kids. We spent our summers relaxing and swimming in the pool. Deemed 'the baby whisperer', he was the only one who could get Carson to stop crying as a baby by singing to him. Telling my children when he was taken away from us was the worst moment of my life. They are innocent and pure, and certainly do not deserve this. They will never know their daddy like they deserve. They won't know him as a jokester. They won't know his contagious smile and his infectious laugh. He was taken from us far too soon. Being a cop's wife is not easy. It's long days and nights when you don't know when they're coming home. It's the constant worry that something will happen to them. It's keeping the kids guiet when daddy needs to sleep for a few hours. It's going to events alone because they have to work and always have to look over our shoulder. But I am so very proud of him. He wanted to make the world a better place, and he did make it a better place for my family. He was a rock. He supported me through thick and thin. He was my

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

everything, and we didn't have him for enough time. I need him, and I don't know how to keep on going without him. I would give anything for one more hug, one more 'I love you', or one more joke from the man I love so much. There are no words to sum up a man who meant so much to me and so much to many others. I only wish to have a world where we stop hating each other. I am overwhelmed with the support I have given ... been given from people everywhere over the past few days. You are good, just like my husband was. He will be in my heart forever. No matter who you are, every person has a story and people love them. Every person has hopes and dreams. We need to accept and thrive on our differences. It's what our country was built on. It's what Jake believed in, even after everything he has been through. It's what I believe in. He saw the worst of the worst every day, but still had so much love in his heart. He was true and loyal. We all need to show each other love. Lift each other up. It's the only way to stop the unconscionable madness.' Becki, your words are so eloquent. We stand with you in this Legislative Body and with your family, and your fellow police brothers and sisters stand with you. And thank you and God bless your family."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Reick on the Resolution."

Reick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Carson, Caleb, I'd like to talk to you. What we're doing today is a sign of respect for what your father... who your father was and what he did. Nothing we do here will be adequate to the task because nothing will bring your father back to you. But you must know that and you will learn that in this world there are bad things and bad people. And we hire people like your father to stand between

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

us and them. And sometimes they don't come home. They call the final act in a first responder's career, if it's a line of duty act, as End of Watch. Your father's End of Watch didn't happen in Rockford. Your father's End of Watch happened when he was bought home to McHenry County and his procession took him to his final rest. Because the hundreds of people who stood along the highway and showed their respect brought an outpouring of grief and gratitude that that act will never... never get rid of. Over the years, as the years go by the pain will diminish but it will never go away. I do hope, however, that what we do here today will somehow give you a reason to understand what happened, why it happened, and that it will ease that pain to some degree although it... as I said it will never go away. God bless you."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Cabello on the Resolution."

Cabello: "Thank you... thank you, Madam Chair. This is for the friends and family of Deputy Keltner. This is very difficult for me for a couple reasons. One, I don't want to make a mistake here because we are honoring a true American patriot. And it happened in the city in which I happened to be a police detective in. We know, as law enforcement officers, that we cannot stop things like this from happening. But we can make sure that you know that we will do our jobs to make sure that he is never forgotten. That is our job and we take it very seriously. I give you my word that he will live on. Now you don't know how many people your husband, and your loved one, and your friend helped. And you never will. But he changed so many peoples' lives for the better that you will never know.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

He is now what I like to say, he is a guardian angel. In my opinion, I believe that he is a protector of the protectors. Your family has grown immensely because every law enforcement officer, every first responder is now a part of your family. We here on the floor of the House of Representatives are a family. We are now a part of your family. We are here for anything that you need. And we love you. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you, Representative. The moment shall take...
oh I'm sorry, the Body shall take a moment of silence. This
Resolution was adopted on a previous day. Thank you, Members.
Representative Sommers, you're recognized."

Sommers: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

Sommers: "I'd like to take a moment to introduce the Body to my two Pages for the day from Washington, Illinois. I have Cash... Cash Wisher who is a student at Central Middle School and Jackson Stewart who is a student at Washington Middle School. Joining them in the gallery, if he will stand, is Cash's grandfather Gary Manier, who also happens to be the Mayor of Washington. Please welcome them all to the chamber."

Speaker Willis: "Welcome to the Capitol. Representative Swanson you're recognized."

Swanson: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Point of personal privilege.

Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

Swanson: "Thank you. It's my distinct honor, today, to introduce Lucy Kuelper. We just honored a family who lost a great American serving as a deputy. Lucy is recognizing all our fire and all our State Police with her own personal campaign

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

of 'Move Over for My Dad'. She's received much national attention and recognition throughout our nation. This evening she's actually going to be on channel 32 Fox News. But Lucy lives in my district, I'm so proud to have her in my district. She's a student at ROWVA High... ROWVA School. She's in the sixth grade. She's cheerleading, softball, and enjoys track, and is an honor roll student. I talked with her this morning and she told me her favorite class was math, so we don't agree on everything. But I certainly agree on what she's doing with her mission. She's the one who started the movement 'Move Over' project bringing awareness to our trav... our drivers on the highways, on the interstates, when you see the flashing lights to move over. Give them room on the road, they're doing the job. She's very active in her community, she's in 4-H. She enjoys showing cattle and swine at the local county fairs. She volunteers as a member of the Flipside Power Tumbling Team. And she enjoys singing the National Anthem at local events. She's also been recognized as the Illinois Volunteer of the Month. With Lucy today are her parents. I'd like to introduce her parents, John who is a trooper on the Illinois State Police, and her mother Jessica. They reside in Rio, R-I-O, Rio, not Rio, Illinois within my district. So please give a warm welcome to Lucy and her parents with us today."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you. And welcome, Lucy. Representative Didech, you're recognized."

Didech: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

Didech: "I'd like to introduce some very special guests in the gallery today. If you could please rise? The delegation from

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

the Council of Islamic Organizations of Greater Chicago. And a special introduction to my good friend Irshad Khan, their Chairman, from the Northern Illinois American Muslim Alliance. These... the council is an organization, they represent over 60 member organizations. They bring together over 400 thousand Muslim Americans in the greater Chicago region. Their mission is to build stronger communities by working in coalitions, strengthening interfaith partnerships towards working for the common good, gaining recognition as a strong and intelligent voice for Muslim Americans, fostering diversity and community life, empowering youth and women, and networking between congregations and communities. I want to thank these group and the council for everything you do for our community for the greater Chicago region and for the entire State of Illinois. And I would ask this chamber to please give them a very warm welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you, and welcome to Springfield.

Representative Villa, you are recognized."

Villa: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

Villa: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I want to follow up what my colleague Representative Didech said. If we could please ask the council to stand up. If you all could stand up to be recognized. Wonderful. I want to send a special shout out to my friend and constituent Naheed Adhami. And I wish you all very good luck today with your endeavors. And meeting with the Representatives here. 'As-salaam alaykum' (Peace be unto you)."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "Welcome to the Capitol. Representative Carroll, for what do you need recognition?"

Carroll: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

Carroll: "I have a young man here. Idrees Muhammed, are you here? Oh, well I'm going to introduce my Page. Well he's... he's my quest today. Unfortunately, we didn't have an opportunity to let him Page. His name is Idrees Muhammed. He comes from Lombard, Illinois. And will be graduating from Chicago Prepatory School of America in 2021. Over the first 2 years of high school he has maintained an overall 4.33 GPA. At CPSA, Idrees is a varsity member of the WYSE, WICT Speech and Mock Trial Teams, winning regional and state awards across the four. He also is a member of the National Honors Society, having volunteered multiple times with the group. He also regularly spends time volunteering at grassroots organizations like SCARE, among others. He spends his time learning new languages. He plans to travel around the world after high school. Idrees has spent the last two years of high school looking into economics and the political field and plans to attend college majoring in political science. For the future he looks to pursuing a career as a policy and financial advisor for companies in the government. Please welcome Idrees to our Capitol. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Welcome to the Capitol. Okay, folks, we're going to proceed with House Bills on Third Reading. These Bills are on Short Debate. Just a reminder how Short Debate will take place, the Sponsor will introduce the Bill and we may have one opponent to respond to that. Okay we're going to start on

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

page 17 of the Calendar under Third Readings, we have House Bill 124, by Representative Arroyo. Out of the record. Proceeding with House Bill... on page 22 of the Calendar, House Bill 3462 on Third Reading with Representative Bristow. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3462, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Willis: "Representative Bristow, you are recognized on the Bill."
- Bristow: "House Bill 3462 would allow school districts to include a course on hunting education and hunting safety in a school curriculum. Hunting and fishing are cornerstones of downstate traditions that many families enjoy. So this legislation would be... would be particularly impactful and helpful in our downstate communities. In... it has been... the language has been approved by ISBE. And I would appreciate a 'yes' vote. This is not a mandate. Instituting the course... and instituting the course is left up to the school's discretion on whether they would like to provide it."
- Speaker Willis: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, we'll go to the question, 'Shall House Bill 3462 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Scherer. Villanueva. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the roll. On the question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Thank you. Going on, on page 22 of the Calendar, Representative Buckner recognized... recognized for House Bill 3393. Clerk, please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3393, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Willis: "Out of the record. On page 19 of the Calendar,
  House Bill 1577, Representative Burke. Out of the record.
  Page 21 of the Calendar, House Bill 2847, Representative
  Conroy. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2847, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Conroy."

- Conroy: "Thank you, Madam Chair. This Bill is called the 'Living Donor Bill of Rights'. And what this Bill does is it gives protection for those who choose to give the lift... the gift of life through being a living donor. In the State of Illinois we have 4000 people waiting for a kidney. This Bill will give protections to those who choose to do so. In the workplace, as well as the life and health insurance areas, they cannot be discrim... discriminated against. In my personal situation I was very fortunate to have the job that I have. And I had the ability to recover and do my job. I would like to be able to offer this to others who will come forward to help to save more lives. And with supporting this Bill, I believe we can do that. And I'd like to thank the Secretary of State's Office who worked very closely with me to make this an agreed Bill. And I'd also like to thank the insurance industry who was a proponent of this Bill. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2847 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all who voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 22 of the Calendar, Representative Crespo on House Bill 3302. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 33... 3302, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Yeah, thank you, Speaker. House Bill 3302 is in response to the State Board of Education's investigation into special education at CPS. The Bill basically will allow parents whose children were harmed by CPS' illegal denials of special education services in the 2016-17 and 2017-18 school years to have at least a two year clock to file a complaint. The timeframe will begin when the State Board of Education's develops and notifies parents of the compensatory education plan based on the State finding of CPS' extensive violations of special education laws. We expect that plan to be in place in a couple of weeks. Happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3302 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all who voted who wish? Thank... thank you. On the question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 1873, offered by Representative Bailey. Clerk, please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1873, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Bailey."

Bailey: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This Bill is a public safety Bill designed to protect school children as they load and unload off of school buses. It enhances penalties for first and second time offenders. I appreciate your support, answer any questions."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Conyears-Ervin is recognized."

Conyears-Ervin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Conyears-Ervin: "So, Representative, I'm going to ask the same questions as of yesterday. Will there be education for residents around Illinois to know that there is an increase from \$150 to \$500? Where is he? Right there. How will the residents know of this increase?"

Bailey: "I think that's very important to let them know there's an increase. And I would work with you to... to do whatever we can do because I think that's within itself what I believe will raise the awareness to protect our children. And I will do whatever you would want to do to work together to make that happen."

Conyears-Ervin: "So I... let me say this, to the... to the Bill. There has been a number of legislation from the other side of the aisle to increase fines, penalties for driving. This is a regressive tax. Just the same as yesterday. What's happening... and I just want to state this because I know this won't be the last. In Transportation Committee all I see is Bills from

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

your side of the aisle increasing fines without any education to residents. It's not that I'm opposed to making certain that our children are safe. It's not that I'm opposed to making certain that when residents operate vehicles, that they are not using electronic devices. But what I am opposed is increasing fines, not educating residents, not notifying them of the fine increase. And what's going to happen is that when the State Trooper issue the violation, what you're going to have is residents that can afford \$500 they're going to pay it and walk away. Residents that cannot afford it are not going to be able to pay it. And then there's going to be consequences where those residents may in turn lose their license, may in turn not be able to go to work, may in turn not be able to put food on the table for their children. I want to really lay that out because I really take these pieces of legislation from your side of the aisle very seriously. And I would love for you all to please, before you're issuing these pieces of legislation... because please know that I care probably more than anyone over there. But I need you to understand that there are haves and have nots in the State of Illinois. And there are people that will have no clue of this piece of legislation. And all you're going to do is put them in a deeper hole. We need to educate residents of Illinois and not just wholeheartedly turn around and start increasing fees to say that's what we're going to do to protect our children. I want to help you protect our children. I fight for our children every day. But this is not the way to do it, to continue to increase fines without any education. I am so offended by all of those that voted for the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Representative's Bill on yesterday. We need to stop this. We need to educate our residents and stop pushing them in a deeper hole. Yesterday I asked that Representative to pull it from the Bill... from the record. I'm going to ask you to do the same. I ask... I'm not talking to anybody but you. Can we also have a standard... I move for a Standard Debate please. Then we should have done this on yesterday..."

Speaker Willis: "Move to Standard Debate."

Conyears-Ervin: "...because we gone deal with this today. You all need to understand. We care. We want there to be safety. But you have to educate residents. This is not the answer. So I ask that you pull this from the record. I offer to work with you when you brought it to committee on yesterday. I offered to work with the Representative on yesterday. Please, the other side of the aisle, before you start bringing these pieces of legislation start thinking about all residents across Illinois and not just ones in your district. I ask for a 'no' vote so that we can work through this piece of legislation, which I would love to. And I ask that everyone would please join me in making certain, again, that we work with you on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Davis is recognized."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Davis: "Representative, are there some circumstances under which, if you are approaching a school bus that stops, the stop arm comes out as well as the arm in front of the bus, are there some circumstances under which you can still drive pass the bus?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bailey: "Yes."

Davis: "Are you changing any of that?"

Bailey: "No."

"Are you certain you're not? Because our analysis says Davis: that these fines increase upon... and I'll read it... read it for you. It says, violation for driver to fail to stop for a school bus if the signal arm is extended. Currently... I'm sorry. House Amendment #1, replaces... raises the mandatory fines for approaching, overtaking, or passing a school bus. Approaching, overtaking, or passing a school bus. So that's the way the analysis reads. And if you tell me the analysis is insufficient, doesn't give all the detail, please, tell me that. But when it says that the fines are raised for approaching a school bus I believe there are some circumstances in which you can approach a stopped school bus with their safety arms, if you will, extended but you can still drive past that school bus. Is that correct?"

Bailey: "You could approach, yes, and stop but not stop, but pass the arm. In which you would still put the student, the children exiting or preparing to load the school bus in danger without completely passing the bus."

Davis: "Well no, no, no. So my question is, are there circumstances under which when a school bus is stopped and you are approaching that school bus, if their arm is out and the stop sign is out that you can still drive past the school bus? Are there circumstances under which that can happen?"

Bailey: "Okay. The fines have to do with passing the school bus while the arm is extended. And that's the first offense fine was \$150, second was \$500."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Davis: "I'm... I'm not sure if you're understanding my question. If

I am approaching a school bus and it's stopped to pick up

children, the stop arm is out on the... I guess the left side

and the arm in front is out, are there circumstances under

which I could still drive past that school bus?"

Bailey: "Absolutely. And that... nothing changes with this Bill as that is written. Are you aware that in October of 2018, three school children were ran over and killed all of one family in Rochester, Indiana. And then immediately after that, ABC Channel 7 in Chicago did a survey and they found out that in the year 2017 bus drivers reported over 20 thousand instances in Illinois where school buses were passed while the arm was out, while children were exiting. I live in a county of 16 thousand. There is not a... I served on the school board for 17 years. I was part of ... I served on the school board when the arms... when all the safety procedures still began to take place. In our area throughout Southern Illinois there are signs throughout... throughout the neighborhoods stating, watch out for stopped school buses and children. Whenever school begins throughout the school system... throughout the school year there are numerous campaigns taken upon. I wish I knew right now who... I know ISBE, they are involved in some of this stuff. So I feel like the education is there but the lack of obeying the law is not. So at what point of these children lives do we... you know, these are lives that are at stake. So for me personally putting some teeth into this thing. This... this is troublesome to me. This bothers me. I don't want to pass a school bus if I know that I'm going to be hit with a penalty that I can't afford."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Davis: "Okay I... I wasn't going to interrupt you. I wanted you to finish your... your speech. First of all, let me talk you off the ledge. I'm not... let me just... let me just talk you off the ledge a little bit. I asked a question. Are there circumstances under which... and well let me maybe ask it a little different. So, I believe that if a school bus... if you're on a four lane highway with say a concrete median in the middle of it and I am traveling opposite the school bus. If the school bus is stopped, I believe, I can still continue to drive past the school bus because there are more lanes available to drive. I believe so. Is that correct? That's what I believe. So again..."

Bailey: "So is there a median between... I mean that nothing changes anything in the law. So is there a median between these highways where the children... with... I mean if you're not in the same lane..."

Davis: "And... and I'm not talking about like an I-55 or where there's this huge median. I'm like in a... in a community where you might have two lanes traveling north, two lanes traveling south, the bus that's traveling north stops at an intersection area, swings out its arms to allow for children to exit the bus. If I am traveling opposite and I am in the other two... one of the other two lanes and there's a median there, I believe, I can still continue to drive pass the school bus. So my question to you is, when you just say approaching a school bus are you changing what I think is the law? That allows me to continue to drive past a school bus..."

Bailey: "Absolutely not..."

Davis: "If..."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bailey: "No that's..."

Davis: "I'm just trying to be clear on that."

Bailey: "...the thank you. That's the language. That language was not changed. The only thing changed in this Bill was changing the first time offense from 150 to 500. And the second time offense to 500 and a thousand. So when I talk to my law enforcement... you know, our county in our... in our area, I mean, there's an obvious concern, you know, about these children. So the... the law enforcement even has this... they can... issue a fine or they can take away license. I guess I felt like it was obviously better to put this fine up there so that people, it might get their attention, so that maybe they won't break the law and they continue to keep their license. So they can continue to go to work."

- Davis: "Well when you say you didn't change anything. So if currently a license can be taken away, are you saying that instead of taking away a license we just raised the fine?"
- Bailey: "Correct. The penalty is the only thing that I... that has changed in this Bill."
- Davis: "Taking away a license is a penalty as well. So again, are you saying that the license... they can keep their license, but they only just pay a higher fine?"
- Bailey: "The law reads nothing... and I'm not changing any of that.

  The law reads..."
- Davis: "Well, no, it sounds like you just... it sounds like you just said..."
- Bailey: "Well you have an opinion, I have an opinion. This is the law and it's interpreted by the deputy or the sheriff or the State Police giving the ticket. I am changing the... the penalty

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

from \$150 from a first time offense to 500. And from 500 to... for a second time offense to 1000. That's absolutely the only thing that changes in this Bill."

Davis: "Well, it sound like you said that you were removing the revocation of the license. So are you... are you removing the revocation of the license and just instituting a higher penalty?"

Bailey: "I am removing nothing. The only thing that changes in this Bill is the penalty enhancement. That's absolutely it."

Davis: "Okay. So absent of this Bill, what is the current fine?"

Bailey: "As I've stated, the current fine, if you overtake a school bus, its \$150 a first time offense. Second time offense is 500... 300, okay. Okay I thought it was 500."

Davis: "So you're saying..."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Davis, can you continue quickly?

We've got a number of speakers still wanting to be heard."

Davis: "Okay. So again, I'll go back to my initial point. It sounds like you're saying approaching a school bus. And I think there are circumstances under which you can approach a school bus. That even if it stops to let children out you can still drive past the bus. So, again I don't know if I'm clear enough as to exactly what you're changing in the law. You say you're not changing it..."

Bailey: "I'm not changing any of the wording, none."

Davis: "...I'm not sure if I'm clear enough. And again, it sounds like you just said a moment ago that you were removing the revocation of the license and just putting a higher penalty in place. That's what it sounds like you said."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bailey: "I am removing nothing. There's nothing being changed except the penalties, the financial penalties. That is it. The law stays the same."

Davis: "Thank you."

Bailey: "Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Guzzardi, you are recognized."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Bill. Certainly appreciate the Sponsor's intent. And as... as my colleague Representative Conyears-Ervin so forcefully and eloquently put it, we are all here to try to protect our school children and make sure that they stay safe. But I believe this Bill is based on a flawed premise. The idea that by raising penalties on certain types of behaviors we will deter those behaviors. We have seen time and time again throughout the course of the last decades that raising penalties on behaviors doesn't deter those behaviors, it just punishes the people who do them more. So raising these fines on this kind of driving isn't going to keep our kids any safer. It's just going to take more money out of the pockets of people who can least afford it. This Bill, while noble in its intent, is detrimental in its impact. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you. Representative Batinick, you are recognized. Are you in support of the Bill?"

Batinick: "I am in support of the Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Okay. Please proceed."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm just sitting over here stunned that we're putting a price tag... that \$150 is too much for the safety of a school kid. I'm looking through other

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

states and what they do. I'm seeing jail time. I'm seeing a \$10 thousand fine. I'm seeing 30 days in jail, 60 days in jail. I'm seeing huge fines. Everybody wants to talk about Minnesota, \$500 fine and up to 90 days in jail for the first offense. We're at \$150, what the education is going to be... the big hit is on the second offense. If they do this and they're not educated after the first offense, they're never going to be educated. This is an extra \$150. I don't even know what time... when the last time this law was changed with inflation. We are at the low end of fines for this, which is probably why it keeps happening because nobody cares they just pay the fine. If this side of the aisle... if that side of the aisle is concerned about \$150 over a school children, vote that way."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Davidsmeyer, you are recognized.

In support I'm assuming?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Question to the Sponsor." Speaker Willis: "Sponsor indicates he'll yield."

Davidsmeyer: "So in your Bill... this is pretty simple. I'm reading through the Bill. You're changing the number... for the first offense you're changing the number 150 to 300, correct? 300? In the Bill it says, you're changing it 150 to 300?"

Bailey: "You are... I'm sorry we doubled back. I'm sorry I thought it was 500."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. And then you're changing, for the second offense, you're changing it from \$500 to \$1000?"

Bailey: "Everything is doubled, that's correct."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Davidsmeyer: "So that's the only change in here, correct?"

Bailey: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. When... when people see a school bus and they see that stop sign go out, do they know that they're supposed to stop?"

Bailey: "I... I believe they should, it's very obvious."

Davidsmeyer: "I would argue that this is something that is taught. It's... it's required to be taught in driver's education. My nephew just went through driver's ed, and they know how serious it is to try to pass a stopped school bus. I don't think that there's any additional education required to let people know. But we will... this will certainly be reported in the newspapers and on... in the news, letting people know that we take these things seriously. Don't you think?"

Bailey: "Yes, that's the intent. Thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "So I want... I want to thank you for bringing this forward. It's a very simple change. And I think it will deter people... when they see that first fine, I think it will deter people from ever doing it again. So we won't even have to deal with... hopefully we won't have to deal with that thousand dollar fine ever. Right, that's the goal?"

Bailey: "That is correct."

Davidsmeyer: "That is the goal. Awesome. I appreciate you bringing this forward. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Members, we have had three speak in support and three speaking in opposition. Representative Bailey to close."

Bailey: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. I would be... I think it would be devastating for us to leave here today and in the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

near future to... to have an accident and know that we did absolutely nothing today. So Representative Ervin has my cell phone number, I gave that to her yesterday. I very much desire to work with everyone on this floor to make this state a more complete and better state. So I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1873 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On the question, there are 74 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present'. Having received the Constitutional Majority, this will... House Bill... let me go back to it... 1873 will be favorably passed... the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 2121, Representative Evans. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2121, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "All right, perfect timing. In the order of bus driving, House Bill 2121 actually removes... excuse me... Senate... House Bill 2121 adds five additional criminal offenses that would bar an individual from being eligible for a bus certificate to be able to drive. And it removes the lifetime ban from... for having a cannabis offense for an individual looking to be a bus driver. Been negotiating this Bill for a couple of years. We watered it down, but we still want to give individuals who've made mistakes in the past opportunities. I ask your support."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "Representative Durkin is recognized... Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. Representative Evans, I just want to make sure that we're talking about... you said that these are cannabis offenses, correct? That we're..."

Evans: "Yes, only. Right now, of course, we need more school bus drivers. And now if you have a cannabis offense you are still barred from having a certificate to be able to be a bus driver. Individuals who have been issue free or problem free for the past 20 years, they still cannot be a bus driver. What we're saying is after 20 years you'll be able to get your certificate."

Durkin: "Does this distinguish between a cannabis offense in which someone is convicted of possession or possession with intent to distribute or distribution or trafficking?"

Evans: "Yeah. Yes, Sir. It's misdemeanor offenses only."

Durkin: "Only misdemeanors."

Evans: "Yeah, I watered it down. We... we took it all out. I didn't want that initially, but I worked with the opposition and we got it to just misdemeanors. Hopefully, we'll come back and see that we need to help individuals who've made real mistakes get jobs. But this one is only focused on misdemeanors."

Durkin: "These are misdemeanors at the time in which they were convicted 20 years ago, correct?"

Evans: "Yes."

Durkin: "Not what otherwise would be considered a misdemeanor even though it was felony 30 years ago because of reductions in penalties, right?"

Evans: "Yes."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Durkin: "All right. And it would be... it only applies to somebody who has had a misdemeanor conviction 20 years ago on any cannabis related offense. That's exactly what you're doing, correct?"

Evans: "Yes, Sir. Yep"

Durkin: "You have my support. Thank you."

Evans: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Evans to close."

Evans: "I ask for support. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2121 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all who voted who wish? Have all who voted who wish? Have all who voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'nay', 0 voting... I'm sorry, 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 20 of the Calendar, House Bill 2259, Representative Feigenholtz. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2259, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Feigenholtz on the Bill."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you... thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2259 is a Bill that increases transparency in the decision making process at HFS at the D&T Board, 'Drugs and Therapeutics Board', at HFS. And it will allow experts in HIV and other rare diseases to opine and provide input on what drugs should be on the formulary. This similar model used to exist at the Department of Public Health but now it's... we're

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

going to do it at HFS. This is also about a floor, not a ceiling. In uniform... some uniformity. And to bring some semblance to the pharmaceuticals that are on the drug list at HFS. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2259 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all who voted who wish? Have all who voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yay', 0 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Having received the Constitutional Majority, the Bill is hereby declared passed. On page 16 of the Calendar, House Bill 2, Representative Flowers. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2, a Bill for an Act concerning health.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Flowers is recognized."

Flowers: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2 provides that every woman has certain rights with regards to pregnancy and childbirth. Including the right to receive care that is consistent with current scientific evidence about the benefits and risks, and the right to choose their birth settings, and the right to have certain information, and the right to be respected, and the right not to be discriminated against. And having a baby is a very difficult decision and each time you have a child it's a different experience. And sometimes the hospitals and the health care providers they think they know what's best and they totally disrespect the family. And so, House Bill #2

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

would merely set forth rights and guidelines. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Bryant is recognized for discussion."

Bryant: "Sorry, I didn't hear the name. Thank you, Madam Chair.
Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "She indicates she will."

Bryant: "Thank you. Oh, can we get Standard Debate on this, please?"

Speaker Willis: "Yes, you may."

Bryant: "Thank you. Representative, thank you for caring so much about this issue. I do just have a couple questions. I know that there were... there's quite a bit of push back on this Bill. And some opposition. I think that maybe with a little bit more negotiation you could get there with the Med Society and the Hospital Association. I'm... 'cause what I'm getting is that there wasn't any communication with them. Can you talk about that? Or could I at least suggest..."

Flowers: "Representative, that... that is so not true. I think if you're talking about the Amendment, I withdrew the Amendment. And so, this is the actual Bill. And there has been communication with the hospital."

Bryant: "Are they still opposing?"

Flowers: "I am... I know of no opposition to House Bill 2. I knew of opposition to the Amendment."

Bryant: "So, they... so we're being told that, yes, they are.

Flowers: "Okay."

Bryant: "So, I would just ask that if this... if this gets the requisite number of votes, would you continue to work on the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Senate side to try to get that opposition off? So in theory I'd like to be with you on this but I do think it still needs a little bit of work."

Flowers: "Representative, I don't mind working with anyone because we know that there is a problem.

Bryant: "Yes, Ma'am."

Flowers: "Women are dying and I had two hearings in the City of Chicago. And the health care providers... the health care providers came to the hearings. And they testified that doctors are making preventable medical errors. Doctors, they said, are racist. Doctors are biased. The providers testified that doctors do not listen to the patient, and specifically African American women."

Bryant: "Thank... thank you, Representative. I'm going to go to the Bill."

Flowers: "And so, my answer to your question is, yes."

Bryant: "Thank you."

Flowers: "I will work with them to the best of my ability."

Bryant: "Thank you, Ma'am."

Flowers: "But they have to acknowledge the fact that there's a problem and they haven't tried to correct and I would like to work with them to..."

Bryant: "To the Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative, to the Bill. Go ahead."

Bryant: "To the Bill. I would just ask... I thank the Representative for agreeing to do that. And I would ask that those here today remember that this Bill is not quite soup. And so, hearing the Representative's commitment to that I would keep in mind

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

that as it moves over to the Senate, we could maybe get there. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Demmer is recognized."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker... Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "She indicates she will."

Demmer: "Thank you, Representative Flowers, for the debate we've had and some of the clarifications you've provided. Just to be... just to be clear, Floor Amendment 1 was not adopted. Is that correct?

Flowers: "Pardon me?"

Demmer: "Floor Amendment 1 was not adopted?"

Flowers: "No, it was not. I withdrew the Amendment."

Demmer: "So we're looking only at the underlying Bill here?"

Flowers: "Yes, that's correct."

Demmer: "And I see it the underlying Bill establishes a list of 21 rights for women with regard to pregnancy and childbirth.

Is that correct?"

Flowers: "That is correct."

Demmer: "And some of those rights are a little bit more detailed than others. Some of the rights... you know, for example the right to receive health care before, during, and after pregnancy and childbirth."

Flowers: "Yes."

Demmer: "That's pretty substantial. Right? I mean, that... that could mean a lot of different kinds of health care. And, you know, maybe would ask a question of what does... what does it mean to have that right? And so, you've charged then, in this legislation, the Department of Public Health to adopt

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

administrative rules to implement this legislation. Is that correct?"

Flowers: "Well I... I need for you think about this for a minute. In the statute... in the federal statutes in regards to Medicaid patients, Medicaid patients if they are entitled to those services before pregnancy, during pregnancy, and after pregnancy. Because remember this is an ongoing situation, you've had major operation. And any type of operation, if you have the quality of health care before, and then you find out that you're pregnant. And then you do the delivery. And then of course during you are entitled..."

Demmer: "Oh, absolutely.

Flowers: "...And then afterwards the care and the follow up of the child."

Demmer: "And yeah... Representative, we're in agreement on the importance of good health care. You know, prenatal during delivery and after... and after delivery. But I think..."

Flowers: "And so, that's part of standards of care."

Demmer: "The question... the question I'm getting at here is that this legislation establishes a list of 21 different rights. And then it says that the Department of Public Health shall implement administrative rules to enforce or to implement this legislation. Have you spoken to the Department of Public Health about this Bill?"

Flowers: "I have spoken to the new director, briefly. And the previous director... no... well he's no longer here. And I tried to have communications with him before he left. And he told... well, it didn't happen."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Demmer: "Does the department... does the department have a position on this Bill?"

Flowers: "I know of no opposition to this. And let me just share with you that..."

Demmer: "Do they... do they support the Bill?"

Flowers: "The director just came on board, but I know of no opposition from the Department of Public Health."

Demmer: "Okay. I... I appreciate that. And..."

Flowers: "And you have to understand that this is their job. This is the Department of Public Health's job. This is what they're supposed to do. And the right... some of the right's that you are enunciating is already in state statute in the Patient's Bill of Rights. That's the part that I'm amending."

Demmer: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, to the... to the Bill. The point that I'm... I'm trying to point at here is that oftentimes we'll pass legislation from this chamber that charges a department with, you know, carrying out the implementation of law and that makes sense. This Bill is notable for a couple of reasons. And the first is, we have 21 rights in here that'll have to be ... be given definitions, be assigned a scope, a size. Who's responsible for providing this right? What's the recourse if this right is not delivered? And we're just sending all of this to the Department of Public Health who doesn't even have a position on this Bill. I mean, I don't know if they're going to know what to do with a charge that says you have to develop administrative rules for enforcing 21 different rights. Some of the things might be under the Department of Public Health's purview. Some things will be under the Department of Human Services. Some things will be

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

under the Department of Healthcare and Family Services. Some things will be outside of government entirely. I think this is incredibly open ended. And the fact that we haven't had a discussion with the Department of Public Health about whether they support this and if they even had an idea about how this Bill would be implemented shows that we're not there yet. So while we can share this ... our sense of urgency to try provide the best possible care for mothers and babies, we need to do so in a way that we actually talk to all the people involved. And that we bring together a shared goal. That we have shared definitions. That we have a shared way of implementing the policies that are actually going to improve health. We can't just say ... sit here today and pass a list of 21 rights and say, all right now it's up to DPH to carry this out. We need to work together on this. We can't just simply pass it along to them. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, Representative Flowers is recognized to close."

Flowers: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the gentlemen's point. First of all, I would like to think that the people that work for these state agencies are well equipped to do whatever is necessary. And I want you to know that the current law, in regards to the Patient's Bill of Rights, is in the Department of Public Health, it's Section 410 ILCS 50 and it's called Medical Patient's Rights Act. That's what it's called. And the same department that put this together will also put the existing laws together that will be put into one place in regards to maternal care. The language in which you're looking at is not new but is set

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

forth in writing. Doctors are violating women's rights every day in the delivery room. We have the Constitutional Rights. We have the human rights. We have the Patient's Bill of Rights. We have all kinds of rights. And we do not give up any of those rights because we're in the delivery room. We are still protected and we're supposed to be respected. If I have a concern about something that a doctor is doing I should be able to voice my opinion. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are hurting women. We are killing women every day and their infants. We should be in the business of protecting our families by any means necessary. This Bill is about protecting women... women. This Bill is about protecting our children. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. Having received the Constitutional Majority, this Bill is hereby declared passed. On page 21 of the Calendar... Representative Demmer is recognized for House Bill 2675. Representative... I'm sorry. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2675, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2675 is an initiative that I picked up after all the work was done on this by Representative Zalewski. He had a full legislative

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

agenda. And so, I'm presenting this Bill today. This is a Bill that sets up distiller licenses for craft distilleries across Illinois. We all know of the thriving industry that exists in craft brewing and craft wineries. This Bill would empower small businesses to do craft distilling and bring their products to a wider variety of people. Establishes licenses for Class 1 and Class 2 craft distilleries. Allows for a certain level of production and self-distribution. And allows certain distillers to distribute through a distilling pub. This Bill, as amended, is a long term agreement between the Wine and Spirits Distributors of Illinois and the Illinois Craft Distillers Association. The Bill allows small distilled spirits manufacturers the ability to grow while maintaining the integrity of the 3 tier system. This Bill provides parity with small beer and wine manufacturers. And at the very least this Legislative Body should not address this issue for at least five years following the implementation of this Bill. I appreciate all the work that was done to bring this to a level of support by various industries. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Guzzardi, are you speaking in favor or opposed?"

Guzzardi: "Favor."

Speaker Willis: "The Sponsor did in favor. Representative Spain, are you in favor or opposed?"

Spain: "Madam Speaker, a question of legislative intent."

Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

Spain: "Leader Demmer, for legislative intent a Class 1 craft distiller may self-distribute a certain amount of gallons,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

but not own a distilling pub. While a Class 2 craft distiller may own a distilling pub but under no circumstances may they self-distribute. Is this correct?"

Demmer: "Yes."

Spain: "Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Halpin, are you in favor or opposed?"

Halpin: "Opposed for the moment."

Speaker Willis: "Go right ahead."

Halpin: "Representative, our analysis originally had the Beverage Association also in opposition. After the Amendment they're not listed at all. Are they neutral or supportive?"

Demmer: "Representative, I'm... I'm not certain of their stance after the Amendment."

Halpin: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Demmer to close."

Demmer: "Thank you. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2675 pass?'
All in favor vote' aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the roll. On the question, there are 108 voting in 'favor', 2 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. Having received the Constitutional Majority, the Bill is hereby declared passed. On page 17 of the Calendar, Representative Ford for House Bill 190. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 190, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Clerk. This Bill is simple. It states that beginning the year 2019 through the 2020 school year a school board will be required to have its school districts connect at-risk students to academic support and the community-based organizations or in-school support. I move for the passage of House Bill 190."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 190 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Keicher. Clerk, please take the roll. On the question, there are 91 voting in 'favor', 22 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 22 of the Calendar, Representative Gabel is recognized for House Bill 3482. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3482, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill makes a minor fix to the Lake Michigan Wind Energy Act. This was a Bill that I passed in 2013. It set up a task force to review some... information about offshore wind. And that task force was never formed. So this Bill just changes the date... the effective date and... so we can have this task force meet."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no questions... no discussion... oh, I'm sorry. Representative Walsh is recognized."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "She indicates she will."

Walsh: "Representative, in committee we had discussion over this Bill. Is there any permitting that DNR, Department of Natural Resources, would have in this Bill? Or is it... is it dependent on the release of the study?"

Gabel: "It's at the release of the study. We took that out on one of the Amendments."

Walsh: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "Thank you. I just appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3482 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yay', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 17 of the Calendar, House Bill 88, Representative Guzzardi. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 88, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Members. House Bill 88 reflects an agreement after years of negotiation on the subject, the members of the Civil-Judiciary committee have heard me discuss this topic a number of times. The issue that we're dealing with here today is around post-judgment interest rates. So people who have received a judgment against

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

them in court for an outstanding debt, those folks can be charged right now under state statute up to nine percent interest. And that judgment can be revived for up to twentyseven years. Nine percent interest over twenty-seven years. This traps many people in cycles of poverty and debt. And we believe that it's unjust. Nine percent is also much higher than most of our neighboring states, is an outlier as far post-judgment interest is concerned. So we've engaged in lengthy negotiations with the financial sector and with the Creditors Bar. And we've reached an agreement, so I know of no opposition to this Bill as it stands. We're reducing the maximum post judgment interest rate from nine percent to five percent. And we're reducing the maximum duration that these judgments can be ... can be revived from twenty-seven years to seventeen years. We believe this is a strong pro-consumer Bill. Again, I know of no opposition and I ask for your support."

Speaker Willis: "Representative McDermed is recognized."

McDermed: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will. Please proceed."

McDermed: "Representative, I think... or did you mention that you've been working on this for over two years?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, Ma'am."

McDermed: "Okay. And over the course of negotiations have you removed all of the opposition from bankers and other of the usual creditors that we see in our state?"

Guzzardi: "Correct. Yeah, we worked with the credit unions, the banking institutions, and the Creditors Bar. And they've all come to neutral on the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- McDermed: "And is it the feeling of the Sponsors of the Bill, as well as the former opponents, that by reducing the length of these judgments and by reducing the interest rate that we will actually encourage compliance with payments?"
- Guzzardi: "Well, that's just it, you know, we want to get people out from under this debt. The objective here is to make sure that creditors get paid what they're owed and that debtors are able to get off from under that debt and go live productive lives."
- McDermed: "And when was the last time that these rates were changed? It goes back quite a while, right?"
- Guzzardi: "Yes. It goes back many decades. Back to a time when the interest rate at large was much higher. So right now that nine percent interest rate seems very out of sync with the very low interest rates that we see in the market generally."
- McDermed: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. This Bill was negotiated over a long period of time with all concerned parties at the table. Those representing debtors and those representing creditors. It's a good Bill, vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Willis: "Representative Thapedi, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Thapedi: "With respect to this Bill that I put in quite a bit of time in the Judiciary Committee on this one."
- Speaker Willis: "Are you in opposition or support of the Bill?"
- Thapedi: "Well as long as I get confirmation of certain things I...

  I may be in opposition."

Speaker Willis: "So inquiry of the Bill? Please proceed."

Thapedi: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Guzzardi: "Yes, I will. Happily."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will. I'm sorry."

Thapedi: "So, Representative Guzzardi, I know that you put a lot of work in this. I think last year we had very detailed subject matter hearings on this matter. Could you do me one favor? Please just walk through the important aspects of the Bill one more time. I know that you have worked very diligently with the Creditors Bar. It's my understanding that the Creditors Bar is now neutral on the Bill. Which was a huge thing for you to have to overcome. And I want to commend you on that. So, please just walk through one more time exactly what aspects you've actually changed. Why it's still remaining in the Code of Civil Procedure, which was a bone of contention at one time."

"Sure. And first of all, thank you so much for your Guzzardi: leadership in committee on this subject. As you said, we had a very exhaustive hearing. You... you gave us the opportunity to expose a lot of these issues which I'm deeply grateful for. So the Bill, as we originally introduced it, touched on a number of aspects of how people are treated in these debt collection cases. We've narrowed it down to two. It only addresses two areas now. One is the maximum interest rate which can be charged, which we're bringing from nine percent to five percent. And the other is the duration of these judgments. So right now judgments, as I said, can be revived for up to 27 years. We believe that that's unduly long. That if you can't collect a judgment in seventeen years, which is the current limit that we're applying in our new Bill. If you can't collect a judgment in that long we believe it should no longer be revivable."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Thapedi: "Thank you for that. And to the Bill. Madam Speaker, I do want to commend the Sponsor on a job well done on this. I also want to thank Dave Manning with the Creditors Bar who bent his clients as much as he could to try to reach an agreement. I urge an 'aye' vote from all the Body on this."
- Speaker Willis: "Representative Skillicorn, do you rise in opposition or in support?"
- Skillicorn: "Support."
- Speaker Willis: "We've already had our supports, we're on Standard Debate. So thank you very much. I'm sorry, Short Debate. Representative Walker. Okay. Representative Guzzardi to close, please."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you so much, colleagues. I appreciate your attention. I want to briefly thank the tremendous coalition of legal aid groups and consumer advocates that have been spearheading this work for the last several years. I'm proud to carry this Bill on their behalf. And also, as Representative Thapedi said, to the folks who were on the other side of the negotiating table with us, they did wonderful work. They were earnest partners. I believe we've got a good compromise product here. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 88 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Having received... this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

20 of the Calendar, Representative Keicher for House Bill 2528. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2528, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Keicher."

Keicher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a Bill that was brought to me from a constituent and it concerns home-based businesses. So under the DBA program or Doing Business As you need to register with the Secretary of State's Office. When you register with the Secretary of State's Office you need to provide a business address. We had a constituent, who opening a home-based business, and therefore, would have their home as the business based address had a stalker and an order or restraint against them, and did not want to publish their home address. So what this Bill does, and we worked with the Secretary of State's Office on this, is it replaces the requirement for the home address to be published. And allows each County Clerk to receive service of summons, or any other official mail on behalf of that home-based business and keeping that address private."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2528 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 21 of the Calendar, Representative

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Halpin is recognized for House Bill 2652. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2652, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Halpin."

Halpin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2652 is a Bill that will allow municipalities that are interested in doing solar projects to make sure that there's a uniform statewide standard as far as the Building Code goes for these projects. The latest Amendment, I understand, removed all opposition. I will grudgingly accept questions. And ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2652 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 21 of the Calendar, House Bill 2540, Representative Harper. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2540, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Blockchain Business

Development Act is a Bill that will allow our state to study
the future of using blockchain businesses here in the state.

I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2540 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Crespo. Have all voted who wish? Skillicorn. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Keicher you are recognized."

Keicher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege.
Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

Keicher: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, I would like to have you welcome the 70th District Student Advisory Council, who's been in Springfield for the last two days hearing from our legislative and executive leaders on how government in Illinois works. They're in the gallery now. If we could give them a nice Springfield warm welcome."

Speaker Willis: "Welcome to the Capitol. Proceeding on Third Reading, on page 22, House Bill 3096, Representative Hernandez. Lisa Hernandez. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3096, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Hernandez please proceed."

Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 3096 will allow a referendum where taxing districts would ask voters for either a flat dollar amount or a percentage rate increase for their districts aggregate extension. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "She indicates she will."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Batinick: "We're just going through the Bills quickly,

Representative. I just wanted to make sure the Amendment
removed opp... all the opposition that we had. There's no..."

Hernandez, L.: "That's correct. Yes, it did."

Batinick: "Thank you for the clarification."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Hernandez to close."

Hernandez, L.: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3096 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 21 of the Calendar, Representative Hurley for House Bill 2766. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2766, a Bill for an Act concerning first responders. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Hurley."

Hurley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2766 is the First Responders Suicide Prevention Act. I won't talk too long but there's some startling statistics for our first responders. The rate of suicide for CPD is 60 percent higher than the rest of the nation for suicide. First responders attempt suicide rate is 10 times higher than the general population. And police and fire... police and fire are more likely to die by suicide than in the line of duty. As of 2017, only 5 percent of the departments had suicide prevention. So 2766, it protects the peer support... the peer to peer support to the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

police and fire and our first responders. It requires mental health specialists to be hired by the departments. It creates a mandatory training. And with the FOID card if you seek mental health you don't initially lose your FOID card unless you're a harm to self or others. We still have some work to do on the Bill. I've agreed with the opposition that it would be tweaked in the Senate. And the Senate Sponsor has agreed. I'm here for any questions and would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2766 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 114 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 19 of the Calendar, Representative McCombie is recognized for House Bill 1690. Take your time. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1690, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Willis: "Representative McCombie. Take your time. Go for it."
- McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. I wasn't watching the alphabet. A couple of weeks ago I ran HB1634, a criminal justice reform Bill. Prior to being ready to the floor, unfortunately, I called it. And since then I have worked with the Secretary of State to remove their concerns. And they are now neutral. And I've also worked with several Members on your side of caucus

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

removing opposition. We have removed the obstruction of justice and also the petitioner submitting to a breath test. We've also removed that piece. I have no known opponents and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1690 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is opened. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the roll... the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 18 of the Calendar, Representative Jones for House Bill 331. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 331, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Members of the Body. I rise to present House Bill 331. And before I begin I'd like to thank Chairman D'Amico and Members of the Transportation Committee for allowing me to present this Bill. This Bill is affectionately known as the Tamara Clayton Act, even though it doesn't say it on the board. I introduced the family yesterday. Part of this Act requires that the local departments, along with sheriffs, and everyone else that they create a program to monitor images and capture images from our expressways where firearm offenses are detected on our highway and also other hazardous. It allows them to not cover petty offenses. Part of this will come out of the road fund, the cost as applied to Cook County will apply to only 35

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

cameras. The estimated cost is \$500 thousand for the cameras. I know of no opposition to this Bill. And I appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Skillicorn."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Skillicorn: "Representative, who maintains these cameras?"

Jones: "Currently it's Illinois Department of Transportation and also the Illinois Tollway. Well, where the Tollway will have cameras."

Skillicorn: "So is it not a private company that administers... you know, does the mailing and administer before it gets to, you know, a police organization?"

Jones: "They don't issue citations. But I'm not aware of that,

Representative."

Skillicorn: "So is this just... is this just for monitoring or is this for any type of citation?"

Jones: "It's for monitoring. As the Bill specifies, it's not to capture any petty offenses, not to go after anyone who commits petty offenses. It only applies to people who are shooting on our expressways. And I will interject and say that in the last 3 years we've had 168 shootings in... on our expressways, 168 shootings. Of those 168 shootings there have been 2... actually 7 arrests. And that should concern us all. The reason that it was named for Tamara Clayton is because she was one of the crime victims that was shot on I-57. And this applies to her and not only the crime victims that have been shot on our expressways."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Skillicorn: "So, I'm not a big fan of traffic enforcement by cameras. Frankly, I think it privatizes the police. And I think there are civil rights issues there. There's Fourth and Fifth Amendment issues there. Can you assure me that this is... I mean, no one wants to see violent crime. And everyone wants to see violent crime prosecuted properly. Can you assure me that this is for violent crime and not traffic offenses?"
- Jones: "Representative, as is clearly stated in not only your analysis but what I've worked on and worked on with all departments and all those involved, is that we won't go after petty offenses. These are for people who are committing crimes on our expressways. And shooting on our expressways."
- Skillicorn: "And then could I also ask one more question? How does this refer and/or apply with the Lockbox Amendment? That it's going... funding is it going to roads or is it going to the cameras? And..."
- Jones: "And that's... that's a great question, Representative. And many of you know that the Lockbox Amendment that was passed allowed for road fund projects funds only to be used for road fund specific projects. This should qualify as that because we're not only going to enhance the safety on our roads and our expressways. But hopefully it's going to allow State Police and local police... give them an extra tool to stop and capture people who are shooting on our expressways. As I just mentioned, we had 168 shootings and only 7 arrests. This will allow local departments not only the ability to capture people faster. But also the ability to work with the state's attorney to make sure we that do it in a manner consistent with the law."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Skillicorn: "So, just to clarify you're saying that investigating shootings has to do with transportation and road funding?"
- Jones: "I mean, that's... you should agree with that as well.

  Anybody shooting on our expressways should be a concern for everyone in this room."
- Skillicorn: "It... it is definitely a concern. But it's a law enforcement concern. It may not be a transportation... I mean we're having situation infrastructures challenge. We're talking about doubling the gas tax. We're talking about increasing fees for driver's licenses. And that money may not be going to the roads but going to investigation. That may not be the best way to fund it. So to the Bill. It's an admirable goal. Frankly, I want to hear more debate on it because I'm not sure where I stand. I don't like the idea of traffic enforcement by cameras. I think there are civil rights issues there. But also we're diverting funds from roads to a different organization. I don't think this... you know, the people of Illinois two years ago voted to change the Constitution. I think we should let that change stick. Thanks."
- Speaker Willis: "Representative Bristow, are you in support or against the Bill? We already... the Sponsor has done that.

  Representative Jones, are you in support or against the Bill?"

  Jones: "I'm supporting my own Bill. Yes."
- Speaker Willis: "Sorry about that. We had it up that way. I think you should. Representative Jones to close, please."
- Jones: "This... I know how impactful the road fund is. And I know the debate we've had over the years in this Body about how the road fund is used. And let me just say that I know that

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

we know that God doesn't make mistakes. And it's kind of fitting that today we're honor... honoring crime victims downstairs. The reason I revised this and named it to the Tamara Clayton Act is because she was shot on I-57 and her family is still dealing with the wounds of that tragic incident that happened on February 4. This Bill will allow not only local police departments the ability to capture people who take the cowardice... cowardly act and shoot on our expressways, but it allows to make sure that we not only closing cases but bringing justice to victims on these families. Nobody should be using our expressways to... commit crimes. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you, Representative. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 331 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Wehrli you're recognized."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Point of personal privilege, please. If I could have the Body's attention. I'd like to introduce my Page for the day. Fatima Ala is... she's currently a junior at College Preparatory School of America in Lombard. She's a National Honors Society member and an AP scholar. She's a Naperville resident down here seeing how we move legislation. In her future she hopes to either go to law school or med school. Hopefully for her sake she goes the medical route because of what she's seeing here today. If we

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- could give her a round... nice, warm welcome to the Illinois House."
- Speaker Willis: "Welcome to the Capitol. On page 24 of the Calendar, under the Order of Agreed Resolutions, we have House Resolution 259, offered by Leader Gordon-Booth. Mr. Clerk, please read the Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 259, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. Be it
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we commend the work being done by Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice to prevent people from becoming victims and assist all survivors in recovering from crime and trauma."
- Speaker Willis: "Leader Gordon-Booth is recognized not only by me, but by her cheering squad up in the gallery. Please proceed with the Resolution."
- Gordon-Booth: "Thank you so much, Madam Chair. Members of the General Assembly, if you have not heard, please turn your eyes to the rear of the chamber and see the beautiful array of crime survivors that are here from all of our districts across this state here to champion the work that we do on behalf of survivors in all of our communities. The Crime Survivors for Safety and Justice does work diligently not just in the State of Illinois, but all across this state... excuse me, all across this country to lift up the voices of individuals who have been victims of crime and violence. All of those that you see up there today with those white shirts on, they have all received phone calls at some point in their life to let them know that someone in their life is now gone.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

There is a pain that you carry when that happens to you. But the beauty in pain is when we decide to not just be victims, but to stand up and be survivors and take that pain and turn it into purpose. And these men and women have absolutely turned their pain from the loss of loved ones and made their purposeful work in the name of the folks that they have lost. And they have changed policy in this state. They have changed policy all over this country that centers survivors at the center of criminal justice reform, that centers healing as it relates to our policies, and encourages a trauma-informed lens, as it relates to what we do on behalf of communities across this state. I thank you for the work that you do. I thank you for the work that you will continue to do. And please know that we all stand with you. Thank you so much."

Speaker Willis: "Leader Gordon-Booth moves for the adoption of House Resolution 259. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, folks. Representative Mah, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mah: "I'd like to introduce my Page for the day, Ami Khalil. Hopefully she can stand up here. She's 16 years old, grew up in Chicago, Illinois. And she's currently a high school junior at Aqsa School in Bridgeview. She's a member of the National Honors Society and the Future Healthcare Professionals Club, among other extracurricular activities. She's an honor student who maintains a 4.1 GPA and she is fluent in speaking and reading Arabic. After high school she plans to attend Moraine Valley Community College to complete her gen ed

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- courses and then transfer to UIC to major in social work. Please give her a warm Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Willis: "Welcome to the Capitol. Representative Hoffman is recognized on House Bill 1633. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1633, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Willis: "Representative... Leader Hoffman to explain Floor Amendment 2."
- Hoffman: "Yes. Floor Amendment 2 is a technical Amendment which changes the intent to commit the following offenses from knowingly to intentionally. It makes it more difficult to bring an action of criminal damage to critical infrastructure."
- Speaker Willis: "Leader Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Willis: "Representative Hoffman on the Amendment."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment would remove the business conspiracy to commit criminal damage to critical infrastructure facilities, criminal trespass to a 'critical infrastructure facility', or 'aggravated criminal trespass' to a critical infrastructure facility. Concern was raised by

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

environmental groups and this was attempt to address their concerns."

Speaker Willis: "Leader Hoffman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Willis: "Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1633, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Hoffman on House Bill 1633."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity. This Bill would address the issue of making sure that the critical infrastructure in Illinois is safe. It creates the offense of criminal damage to critical infrastructure. The offense of aggravated criminal trespass and the offense of trespass. There's been much discussion regarding this Bill and where it came from. I can tell you that this was brought to me by a coalition of the Illinois AFL-CIO and the Illinois Manufacturers' Association. I have made several changes to the Bill to attempt to address issues that were raised by the environmental community. I have attempted to work with them throughout this entire process. We just adopted two of the Amendments of ... an additional one was adopted earlier. I can just go through the Amendments that... that I have made on this Bill and while... why I think that some of the opponents are misplaced in their opposition. I lowered the penalty for criminal damage to critical infrastructure from the original

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Class 1 to a Class 3 felony. I clarified in the Bill that this would not impede the right to free speech or assembly, including but not limited to protesting or picketing. I also changed the intent to commit to the criminal damage from the intent of knowingly to intentionally which was Amendment #2. And I removed entirely the conspiracy to commit criminal damage and to commit criminal trespass or aggravated criminal trespass. This addressed 90 percent, I believe, of the opponents' opposition. However, I don't believe that we can go any further if we're going to be real and address the issue of making sure that our critical infrastructure in this state is protected."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Gabel is recognized for discussion."

Gabel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Could we move this Bill to Standard Debate?"

Speaker Willis: "Yes, we may."

Gabel: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Gabel: "So I... I understand that you have made some changes to this Bill. But it's my understanding that this Bill actually is an ALEC Bill, that it has been passed in 24 other states. Are you familiar with that?"

Hoffman: "I have been told that but that is not who brought the Bill to me. The AFL-CIO brought the Bill to me."

Gabel: "And this Bill has enhanced and excessive penalties. What...
how have you raised these penalties?"

Hoffman: "Well, I lowered the penalties significantly from the introduced Bill. In... matter of fact, the Amendment for the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

initial introduced Bill was a Class 1 felony, I lowered that substantially. And in addition, I lowered the penalty for criminal trespass to a critical infrastructure facility to a Class 4 felony. So I did lower the offenses considerably from the introduced Bill. I don't... I understand..."

Gabel: "But you still increased them considerably."

Hoffman: "Excuse me?"

Gabel: "But you still increased them considerably from... they're already penalties now. Why do you feel that we need to increase these penalties?"

Hoffman: "This offense doesn't… doesn't exist now. The offense of criminal damage to a critical infrastructure does not exist.

It's a new offense."

Gabel: "Can that behavior be punished now?"

Hoffman: "I'm told by staff for a nuclear facility, yes. This adds additional critical infrastructure to... to that. So we took the definition of critical infrastructure from the Obama administration and incorporated it into... into this Bill."

Gabel: "Seems like the definition is very broad and it's kind of
 damage to any property."

Hoffman: "That's... that's not the intent."

Gabel: "I understand that it's not the intent but that's the concern. You know, when... when we change these laws and make them very broad my concern is that it's going to impact people's ability to... to protest any kind of issue that they want to protest in this country. And..."

Hoffman: "And, Representative, I respect... I respect your views, but I believe that some of the... there has been misinformation regarding my intent and misinformation regarding the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Amendments which I have made. I have removed the vandalizing or defaces any property is removed from the Bill. It has to be criminal damage to property or trespass. I removed vandalize and deface. So that was a concern brought to me by the environmental community, I removed it from the Bill. I also made sure that peaceful protest would be specifically allowed under the Bill. And First Amendment... the exercise of First Amendment rights would not be impeded. That's... that's all in the Bill. I put that in the Bill to address their concerns."

- Gabel: "And can you tell me what the risk to non-profit organizations is under this Bill?"
- Hoffman: "There... there should be no risk because I took out the whole offense of conspiracy. That was removed on Amendment #3."
- Gabel: "And that removes any... any threats to non-profits completely?"
- Hoffman: "If... if a non-profit carries out an act of criminal damage to property and it is intentional... I changed the word knowingly to intentional... then, I believe, that they could be charged with an offense. But if a member of theirs does it and there is no more conspiracy in the Bill."
- Gabel: "Well, I appreciate the changes that you've made to the Bill. I still have concerns about this Bill. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Cassidy, you are recognized."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he'll yield."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Cassidy: "So, I just want to be clear, because I don't think that...
that it really came through. And I know that you've worked
hard to try to get to an agreement on this and I appreciate
all of your efforts. But everything that you are... every
behavior that's addressed in this Bill could already be
addressed criminally. Could it not? Criminal damage to
property carries an offense... carries a punishment?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Cassidy: "Criminal trespass carries a punishment?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Cassidy: "To the Bill. We have worked really hard in a bipartisan fashion for the last couple of years to address issues of criminal justice reform. And to work together to right size our criminal justice system. And it seems like we are abandoning that path here with this and some of the other things that have been moving this Session. And I just want to make sure that we understand we're not done. That these penalties exist. These... these behaviors are already criminalized. We don't need to double down. We don't need to put more people in... in prison for longer. And in particular for offenses that are already in our... in our criminal justice codes. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "Thank you. Will the ... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Stava-Murray: "So in... in our committee the other day I asked a question that we didn't get an answer to. So I was wondering if you had a chance to get the answer to this. So, what percentage of areas in the State of Illinois are going to be

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

covered by this new Act? Which... what percent of the area or what approximation, if you don't have an exact percent, of the area of the land in Illinois is going to be covered by this Act?"

Hoffman: "I... I think probably the reason that it wasn't answered 'cause I really don't know the answer."

Stava-Murray: "So..."

Hoffman: "But I would say that a very, very small percentage would be covered."

Stava-Murray: "So your interpretation is that it is a small percentage. And the interpretation to my understanding of the Illinois Environmental Council is that this could be an extremely large percentage of the land of Illinois. And so, there seems to be a gross discrepancy in what we may actually be covering with this Bill. And so, we're asking to create legislation for an undefined area of space. Is that accurate, that we don't have a defined area of space beyond saying that there's a sign that says, 'no trespassing'?"

Hoffman: "No... no, the definition of what is critical infrastructure was taken from a... a President Obama Executive Order. We just mirrored it here. And that would... that is the definition. So to say what percentage of Illinois contains critical infrastructure, I just don't know the answer."

Stava-Murray: "Doesn't this expand the notion of critical infrastructure to include other areas such as train tracks?"

Hoffman: "That was in the Obama Executive Order."

Stava-Murray: "So I'm not saying that Obama didn't say that. But what I'm saying is that we're... we don't have an understanding when we're saying we're going to increase penalties here of

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

what areas are going to be increased penalties. How are the people enforcing this law going to know whether or not this law applies?"

Hoffman: "Because there is a specific definition of what is considered critical infrastructure in the Bill."

Stava-Murray: "And what does this Bill do to prevent discriminatory enforcement of it?"

Hoffman: "I'm sorry. I... I couldn't hear I'm sorry."

Stava-Murray: "So in many... in many issues with laws... with laws are when they're discriminatorily enforced. So how are we going to prevent discriminatory enforcement of this law? How is that included in this Bill?"

Hoffman: "Well, the law is the law and people have... would enforce it. I don't know that I can... I really don't know how to address that. I can tell you this, that years ago I was the chief Sponsor of a... and then Senator Obama had it in the Senate of outlawing racial profiling. So I have a long history of trying to make sure that laws in the State of Illinois are not unfairly being enforced upon a certain sector of our communities."

Stava-Murray: "And I appreciate that history. But what I'm concerned about is this Bill that we're talking about right now. So how many injuries resulting from dangerous criminal... how many injuries to Illinois workers, resulting from dangerous criminal damage to property have happened in the past five years? How many... how many injuries resulting from dangerous criminal damage to property happened in the past five years?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Hoffman: "I don't... I don't have that. But I can tell you that there have been reports from the Illinois AFL-CIO as well as the Illinois Manufacturers' Association of individuals messing with things like brake lines and things like that on bulldozers that have resulted in... in crashes that have resulted in injuries."
- Stava-Murray: "But we don't have a specific number. When I asked in committee the answer for the past year was zero. And so, I was just wondering for the past five years. So we don't have that kind of..."
- Hoffman: "I don't have that. I don't have that number."
- Stava-Murray: "Okay. And in terms of when I asked in committee they said that there was relatively light slap on the wrist for someone who had messed with equipment, where the equipment was subsequently damaged, was there any further incidents that have happened since that relatively slight slap on the wrist, as you put it, until now?"
- Hoffman: "I... I don't have that information."
- Stava-Murray: "So when we talked about it in committee you answered that there had not been... or the experts testified that there had not been any more incidents. So it seems like the enforcement that we have in place is working. And so, I'm wondering why we need to enhance penalties when the penalties that exist seem to already be working to prevent these problems?"
- Hoffman: "And, Representative, as I indicated earlier, the Bill as introduced I thought had too harsh of penalties. So, I lowered that through... through Amendments."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Stava-Murray: "Well, then I'm not talking about as introduced,

  I'm talking about the Bill right now."
- Hoffman: "I don't know that... I don't know that addresses your issues."
- Stava-Murray: "Yeah. So why are we enhancing penalties for crimes that seem to be deterred already?"
- Hoffman: "Because it's my belief that criminal acts of sabotage and tampering... van... tampering or trespassing of critical infrastructure can have a drastic impact not only on workers but on the communities at large."
- Stava-Murray: "To the Bill. I encourage a strong 'no' vote on this issue. As we've just spoken about we're not sure about where these areas actually are. They say they're clearly defined but the clear definition is a sign that says, 'no trespassing'. Did the person walking in the woods see a sign that's on a tree somewhere? We don't know. There's no way to determine this in many cases, we're leaving it up to subjective judgment. And when there is subjective judgment we're more likely to see ... we're more likely to see discriminatory enforcement. And beyond that we're increasing penalties for something that doesn't ... isn't likely to occur or is very low likelihood to occur and when it has happened we haven't seen repeat offenses. So it seems like what we're doing is already working. This is a part of a larger initiative of other states. And I appreciate the work the Sponsor has done to reel it in from how terrible it is in its state in other states. But at the heart of this Bill this is ALEC legislation and I strongly urge us to vote 'no'."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Speaker Willis: "Representative Bryant, do you stand in opposition of the Bill or in support?"
- Bryant: "As hard as it might be to believe, I'm standing in support with Leader Hoffman."
- Speaker Willis: "You are recognized then, go for it."
- Bryant: "Leader... first will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."
- Bryant: "First, let me applaud you on carrying a Bill that both the AFL-CIO, and IMA are in support of. So, thank you for carrying this Bill. I have a couple questions for you. First, I believe in committee you referenced an incident with a train. And that the… was there not an issue where the… a train ran into something and they couldn't be charged? Do you remember that?"
- Hoffman: "I'm sorry that... that may have been referenced by the expert witnesses."
- Bryant: "Oh was it... okay. There was a bulldozer that ran into a train."
- Hoffman: "Yes, Mark... Mark Denzler referenced that from the Illinois Manufacturers' Association."
- Bryant: "And for some reason without this law they were not permitted to charge the individual with something more than just a slap on the wrist. I believe that was your..."
- Hoffman: "Yeah, they were charged... they were charged but not to this degree."
- Bryant: "So just a couple questions then on the Bill. So with this Bill is it possible for someone to accidentally be on a property?"

Hoffman: "No."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bryant: "Thank you."

Hoffman: "Well, they can accidentally be on the property but they couldn't be convicted under this... this law."

Bryant: "Right. Can someone be charged if they accidentally harm any of the property?"

Hoffman: "It has to be intentional."

Bryant: "Thank you. And I note... I note that you changed the wording so that it would go from knowingly to intentionally. I've run some legislation here where I was told that it couldn't pass because intentional is very difficult to prove. I know that you're an attorney. Is there a strict standard for this where it would have to be proven that someone intentionally did something harmful?"

Hoffman: "Yes. And the reason that we... I changed that is in order to address some concerns of not only the previous speakers but also the Environmental Council."

Bryant: "And did you also... you might have touched on this, but you also removed a phrase I think that referred to conspiracy. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes. The entire conspiracy section is removed."

Bryant: "Thank you very much for the Amendment. I thought it was a good Bill before. It should be a good Bill for both sides of the aisle with your Amendment. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you. Representative Guzzardi, I'm assuming you're want to stand in opposition. We've already had three in opposition. So we're going to pass over you. Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand in strong support. Will the Sponsor yield?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Unes: "Representative, you may have already mentioned this and I apologize if you... if you have. It's been a little but noisy during... during debate. But if you have could... isn't... isn't true that this is an initiative of both the IMA and the AFL-CIO?"

Hoffman: "Yes, it is."

Unes: "So we have industry and labor coming together for a very important cause, right? To make sure that we're protecting against damaged critical infrastructure in the state of Illinois."

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Unes: "So, to the Bill. Madam... Madam Speaker, I think it's very important that everyone hears that. This is industry and labor together... working together, which is what we hear that we want so many times in this building. This is what they're doing here. They're working together. Keep in mind, that this only comes into play if there is purposeful... someone purposefully is damaging critical infrastructure. In order for us... this is in order for us to protect our safety. I would urge a strong 'aye' vote from everyone in this Body. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "This Bill was on Standard Debate. Having heard three in support, three in opposition, Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Yes, I'd just like to address some of the issues that were raised. I've really attempted to work this out and do it in a fair manner, working with organizations that represent the environmental community. But this is indeed an issue that

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

affects working men and women throughout the state, as well as manufacturers, as well as communities. It's... it should be a criminal act to sabotage if you tamper, or trespass, or hurt great damage to critical infrastructure facilities. It should be. It needs to be. I'm not backing away from that one bit. I get what people are saying. But let me tell you what I've done. I've lowered the penalties. I've clarified that there's a right to free speech and assembly, including but not limiting to protesting and picketing. I took out the offense of conspiracy. I made sure that this actually addresses the type of critical infrastructure protections that we need in this state. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1633 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have... have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting in 'favor', 28 voting in... 'against', and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sommer, you are recognized."

Sommer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

Sommer: "Once again, it's my pleasure to introduce state champions from my district. They're in the gallery above the Republican side. If the young men would please stand. The young men attired in orange and black are the Washington High School Panther Wrestling Team. This is quite an extraordinary dynasty I might say, led by Coach Nick Miller. This year they

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

have won their fourth straight State Wrestling Championship. Please welcome them to the House of Representatives."

Speaker Willis: "Congratulations. On page 17 of the Calendar,
House Bill 92, by Representative Kalish. Clerk, please read
the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 92, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Kalish."

"Thank you, Madam Chair. This is a very important piece of legislation. This is an ICASA, the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault initiative. We're trying to solve a problem. This is a very serious problem that exists within the health care community. And here is what we're trying to accomplish. If a man or a woman report themselves to a medical facility and identify themselves as a victim of sexual assault and they request to receive emergency medical assistance or medical forensic services for sexual assault, unfortunately such an individual is also named in a war ... in a warrant. And that... at this time that individual will be arrested at the medical facility. What we are trying to accomplish... and we are working with the Sheriff's Association, we're working with the Prisoner Review Board, we're working the State's Attorneys. What we are trying to accomplish is to make sure that if the warrant has been issued in a non-violent crime that that individual will not be arrested but rather they will be given a notice to appear. So our goal here is to encourage those... those victims to seek medical attention. Our goal here is not to add more trauma to individuals of sexual assault. And our goal here is to make

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

sure that we catch the real perpetrators of more serious crimes. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I request Standard Debate."

Speaker Willis: "Your request is granted."

Batinick: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, very nice to talk to you today. I heard a lot of we are working when you were describing the Bill. So what you're telling me is that this Bill is not soup yet, correct?"

Kalish: "Yes. As your colleague mentioned earlier, I believe the colleague from Mt. Vernon mentioned about a different piece of legislation. We are trying to pass something out of the House today that is not yet soup but with the goal of keeping pressure on the different sides to come up with the appropriate the language to create soup and solve a problem."

Batinick: "What are some of the issues in trying to get it towards soup?"

Kalish: "Right now there would be a constitutional issue as it relates to issuing a provisional warrant, which is what we are trying to accomplish. So we have to overcome the provisional warrant challenge. And I have spoken to criminal attorneys, as well as your colleague from Kankakee and others to try to come up with language appropriate."

Batinick: "What's a... I'm not a... an attorney. You may be surprised by that."

Kalish: "Neither am I."

Batinick: "What is a provisional warrant?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Kalish: "A provisional warrant is basically a warrant, it doesn't
   exist, but if a judge would issue a warrant unless, you know,
   X, Y, Z right now that would be a constitutional challenge."
- Batinick: "Okay. So what you're saying is, is the provisional warrant doesn't exist. But you're trying to create a situation where it may exist in the future?"
- Kalish: "Right. What we're trying to do… is the Sheriffs' Association mentioned during the… during committee… what we're trying to do is give cover to those peace officers who find themselves in this situation. And allow them to communicate effectively with the judges who have issued the warrant."
- Batinick: "So I'm going to be... show my cards here a little bit.

  I think you were starting to describe a situation where this came up. And we're always not sure what Bills coming up and when. And we we are scrambling trying to figure out and organize over here. Can you please go through the situation that this applies to for me?"
- Kalish: "Absolutely. Let's say an individual has unpaid car payments. Let's say an individual has unpaid tickets, non-violent crime individual... and a non-enforceable felony, you know, financially related ends up in the... ends up getting sexually assaulted, goes to the hospital for the rape kit. At that point the hospital will identify the individual as being... having a warrant for their arrest. They will call... the peace officer has been called anyway because of the sexual assault. At that time the peace officer will read the Miranda Rights and arrest that individual of sexual assault for a non-violent crime."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Batinick: "So... okay."

Kalish: "We are trying to accomplish..."

Batinick: "So... so basically... so basically your concern is that if there is a warrant out for your arrest and you're the victim of sexual assault, you can't contact a peace officer in any way, shape, or form to protect yourself from the domestic violence situation because you're going to get arrested on something else or taken into custody on something else?"

Kalish: "Did you read the Bill?"

Batinick: "I've... I've read hundreds of Bills."

Kalish: "No, that's not what we're doing.

Batinick: "Okay. Okay."

Kalish: "The peace officer will notify the individual. You can absolutely call the peace officer. A peace officer will be called because this person is a victim of sexual assault."

Batinick: "Right no... no, I know you can. I'm saying there's a concern that they won't because there's a concern they're going to be brought on..."

Kalish: "Who's concern?"

Batinick: "The victim."

Kalish: "Yes, that is why the victim may not go to ... "

Batinick: "That was my... that was my..."

Kalish: "Yes. Thank you. Sorry."

Batinick: "Okay."

Kalish: "That is why the victim may not go to the hospital. That is our concern. And therefore, we will not be able to catch the real perpetrator of a... a vicious crime."

Batinick: "And was this... what was the genesis of the Bill? How often does this happening over and over?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Kalish: "It's happening often. In fact, this is a similar
  legislation that has been passed in prior years on other types
  of offenses. It... unfortunately, it's more common than we
  think."
- Batinick: "And was there a specific incident in your district? Or just..."
- Kalish: "No. I... I've been working with the Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault in my private company for a number of years. And I very much appreciate their work."
- Batinick: "Okay. So it... it came from your private work and you...
  do you have a number? I mean, is this dozens of cases,
  thousands of cases?"
- Kalish: "Oh it's... I mean I would imagine based on my knowledge it
  would be, you know, often."

Batinick: "Okay, often."

Kalish: "Too often."

- Batinick: "And then obviously so right now the Sheriffs' and the State's Attorneys are still opposed to this?"
- Kalish: "Right now the Sheriffs' and State's Attorneys are opposed but working with us. You know, yesterday 5 o'clock we're still convening. We have Senate Sponsors lined up to be able to continue to work with us should we pass out of the House today."
- Batinick: "Okay. I'm going to go to the Bill. I think this is one of those..."
- Kalish: "They're not... right, they're not opposed to the idea.
  That's important to know. Right."
- Batinick: "Thank you for that phrasing. I'm going to go to the Bill. I am not opposed to the idea. This is kind of one those

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

situations where we have these somewhat artificial deadlines. And I know why we have them. We have to get a certain amount of Bills passed. I have serious concerns about throwing something to the Senate that may be unconstitutional. I believe that it's the House that does the good work in this building. And I like things to be finalized here in the House. So I'm going to go ahead and urge everybody to proceed with caution. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick, I actually agree with you on this one. Representative Cabello you are recognized."

Cabello: "Thank you, Madam Chair. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Cabello: "Representative, as we talked in committee, as I'm going through some of the conversation here, what happens... because it does quite often where somebody comes to the police department several days or weeks after the unfortunate incident took place. Do then... and they do have a warrant. The police will still try to take them to the hospital to try to obtain any evidence that they possibly can. Does then the police not able to arrest this person on a warrant?"

Kalish: "If... if the only reason for contact is because they are reporting. Right? Or requesting medical attention."

Cabello: "The police will try to assist them because we still want to get... there could possibly be evidence."

Kalish: "Correct."

Cabello: "So there could be a situation where they come after the initial attack, weeks later. And they possibly have a warrant.

Would the police be able to arrest them on the warrant then?"

Kalish: "No... no."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Cabello: "I believe under the Bill it wouldn't... they would not be able to."

Kalish: "Right. That is correct. That is correct, Sir."

Cabello: "So as in committee..."

Kalish: "Again, for a non-violent crime."

Cabello: "Correct. As in committee, I am willing to work with you on this. As in committee, I have some major... we're telling a law enforcement officer to disregard a court order from a judge which states we command you to bring this person before the court as soon as possible. Are there going to be any safeguards in this Bill that will make sure that the officer that is disregarding the court order not then be in violation of that order and be subject to being arrested?"

Kalish: "That is why we are working with the Sheriffs'. To... that is the exact challenge that we are trying to overcome."

Cabello: "Let me ask you one last question. If this is not able to be worked out in the Senate, are you going to hold this Bill? And if you do, I will vote 'yes'. And if you do, I will work as hard as I possibly can to help you move this Bill forward."

Kalish: "Yeah. We put this on the record in committee and I'm putting it on the record now that we have every intention of working this out with the Sheriffs'. And if we do not... if we cannot, we control the Sponsors over there. And both us and the Sheriffs' and we will hold it."

Cabello: "To the Bill. I highly recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative... Leader Durkin, you are recognized."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Durkin: "Representative, you're exempting forcible felonies, correct?"

Kalish: "Yes."

Durkin: "All right. Now I just... have you looked at the definition of forcible felony? I'm familiar with it. But one thing that I always... when we talk and we just, you know, routinely will use and exempt something it may be determined a forcible felony. But there are some crimes that are pretty serious that are not considered forcible felonies. Let me give a couple examples of that. And I want to make sure that you understand that you may be allowing people with certain crimes will not be ... that are going to be covered under this. It doesn't exempt people who are in the narcotics trade. Those who distribute, traffic, possess with intent. Whether it's marijuana, heroin, fentanyl, methamphetamine. Those are considered... those are not forcible felonies. Please consider that... please consider that as you work through this Bill. Okay. I got a recommendation also. I know a little bit about this world. I used to do it. This provisional warrant, there's no such thing. It's not going to ... to work. I would move away from that. That's not something... the State's Attorneys are spot on. It's unconstitutional. You can't have a warrant that is just discretionary. It just doesn't work. My other question I have for you, what about a federal warrant? A warrant that is issued from the United States District Court on an Illinois citizen that is stating that I am a victim of sexual assault. Would this bar the Federal Court from having that warrant executed?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Kalish: "No. The answer to your question is, no. They're not
 barred."

Durkin: "All right. Thank you. Now you and I talked yesterday. And I originally didn't like this Bill. And I made that very clear to you. But this does present a very... a little bit of a complicated set of circumstances that you're trying to balance the right approach in the sensitive nature of these matters. I would appreciate it if I can see some specific examples. If someone... you can redact the names of the individuals, of how this is been a concern. It would help me and my caucus if we understand what exactly has occurred. We've heard anecdotal stories. But I would appreciate if you can provide that to me. But I also wanted to say that ... and I hope the people are listening here... but this is a Bill that 24 hours ago that I was going to do everything I can to defeat it. But I had a conversation with you and I've said that I'm going to exercise good will and good faith and support your Bill today with the hope that you can get a negotiated resolution with the State's Attorneys and also enforcement. Because I do believe that there is a question that ... that we haven't quite addressed. That we don't want to, you know, just look the other way. But it is very complicated. And I agree with all that my colleagues have said. And I hope you take that into consideration with your negotiations. But as I take you at word that you will negotiate and that hopefully you can bring resolution to this if it comes back on concurrence. So for today you have my support."

Kalish: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Pappas."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Pappas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Kalish, if I understand this Bill correctly what you're trying to ensure is that we don't penalize victims of sexual assault who haven't committed forcible felonies for seeking medical attention and for reporting the crime that has been committed against them. Is that correct? And I understand that the Bill is not completed yet and that you have committed to continuing working on it in the Senate. I'm just curious what, if any, alternative propositions have been brought to you by the opponents of this Bill?"
- Kalish: "A safeguard. I mean we have the... I had the attorney... the criminal defense attorney send me some language that, you know, would be something that we think law enforcement, you know, could live with. And that to accomplish... to accomplish our goals. So, you know, we have... we hope to present that to them shortly. We have some safeguard language."
- Pappas: "And law enforcement has committed to continue working with you?"
- Kalish: "Yeah, law enforcement has committed to working with us. In fact, we really want them to... we want this to be a, you know, a good Bill. We really want this to be a good piece of legislation that's protecting victims of assault as well as making sure that we follow the process of law."
- Pappas: "Thank you. To the Bill. Very recently we passed legislation in this House that extended the statute of limitations for sexual assault... basic... that erased the statute of limitations for sexual assault. Because we understand how devastating that kind of crime can be and how it impacts our entire state. I think that this Bill, while

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

not fully ready is... has the right intentions. Not just for the victims that are in question in the Bill, the victims who have the warrants against them. But we want to encourage victims of crimes to report these crimes because such reporting will help protect other potential victims in Illinois. So I believe law enforcement should do everything they can to help people who are victims of crimes report them and not be penalized solely for reporting crimes that have been committed against them. And so, I would strongly urge all of the Members to vote for this Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Kalish to close."

Kalish: "I really appreciated the conversation and the debate. As I've mentioned to all of my colleagues who have spoken to me about this piece of legislation, as well as Leader Durkin, our goal is to pass... is to finalize a very good piece of legislation. And I would hope that you could vote with me on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 92 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 88 voting in 'favor', 20 voting 'against', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kifowit on House Bill 2627. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2627, a Bill for an Act concerning education. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "Third Reading, please. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2627, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Kifowit on the Bill."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. In a night in January, Corey Walgren sat with his parents in a kitchen and talked about the colleges he wanted to visit over spring break. He was 16 and he didn't know what he wanted to study, maybe business, maybe astronomy. Unbeknownst to his family that night, that turned out to be the last night of his life in January. Corey Walgren was a 16-year-old straight A student, athlete, and an all-around good kid. And the next day when he went to school during lunch time he was... he was asked questions by the resource officer and the dean on an incident that involved his phone and possibly some kind of sexual teenage information. It turned out not to be on his phone. For 16 minutes he was interrogated without his parents present, without anybody being notified... for 18 minutes, I'm sorry. And then when his mother got the call she agreed that he would do whatever needed to be done. And he was pretty much told that he would be a registered sex offender his whole life and, was according to his mother, they wanted to make an impression on him. They made an impression on him because on that day at 2:38 p.m. Corey Walgren left school. He was a brother, a hockey player, a fisherman, an honor roll student, and he had a great group of friends. And he plummeted to his death of 53 feet below off a parking deck because something was said in that room that his parents don't know about that

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

caused him to believe that he had to take his life. That is the genesis of this Bill. This Bill states that in connection with a crime that a parent or parent designee should be present with their child. I personally know adults who get nervous and anxiety when dealing with police. And we have talked many times in this Body about the cognitive development of children, of 16 year olds, of 17 year olds and how sometimes they just don't understand. And it's clear that what happened to our Naperville teen, Corey, he did not understand and he was confused. That led him to ultimately take his life. Currently, as reported, only in cases of immediate danger and in a fear of information being destroyed are exceptions to a case where in our code with regards to interrogation. However, it's been expressed to me that's not clearly... we didn't change that in this Bill, but it's been expressed to me that there are concerns that's not it explicitly stated. This Bill will give students, will give parents a piece of mind to know that somebody is in the room with them when they are being questioned by an officer in regards to a criminal crime. This Bill was filed on February 14. We have been working on it for a while. Just this week, deadline week was when I was contacted by some opposition. I have talked to the Senate Sponsor. We are currently drafting language to help clarify some exceptions in cases of emergencies, as I mentioned. And that it will come back for concurrence with those changes. It's not an 'if' it is a 'will'. And it is a commitment for that. And, Madam Speaker, I ask for support of this Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Windhorst."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Windhorst: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "She indicates she will."

Windhorst: "Thank you, Representative. And I appreciate you bringing this Bill. That was a horrible situation that occurred and our heart goes out to the family that experienced that difficult situation. I do have a couple technical questions about the Bill. The first relates to the use of the word detain. Would that allow a law enforcement officer or school resource officer to detain the student before notifying the parents?"

Kifowit: "What... again, as I said in my opening statements, law enforcement just came to me, in fact, on Monday of this week. So some of those clarifying technical changes we are going to address in the Senate. However, this... this really looks to be if there's an immediate threat or if there... in our interpretation and of course as I said law enforcement wants this more clarified, current statute says if there's an immediate threat or if there is a fear of evidence being damaged that they could be detained now. What our intention is, is if there's not an immediate threat for the officer to arrange with the parent so that they can both, the parent and the student or a parent designee in case a parent can't be there to arrange for that meeting to occur."

Windhorst: "Would there be... would it be the intent then for the student to remain in class or in the school before notifying the parents in any other situation?"

Kifowit: "If there's no immediate threat then I don't see why the student has to be removed from the class until the parent gets there. I think that we can clarify that. But again, if

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

it's an instance like this where a student had something on their phone and they had no reason to believe there was an immediate threat. I mean, they did wait 'til lunch time. I don't see how they couldn't have waited another half hour for their mom. I mean the minute his mom got the call she was on the road to get to the school but they had already interrogated him for 18 minutes beforehand. I... I can't see how something like this could not have waited a half hour for their parent to get there."

- Windhorst: "Do you have any proposed language? Or any language that you're suggesting for an Amendment in the Senate?"
- Kifowit: "We're... we're working on that right now. Again, the opponents just came to me on Monday. This Bill has been out there since February. I wish they would have been cognizant of the deadline. As the Leader said, we do have deadlines and they are arbitrary. And it would have been nice and polite for them to come months ahead of time 'til this point in time. But I'd be working with the Senate Sponsor and with them. This Bill will come back for a concurrence. So you will be able to see any changes in the Senate again."
- Windhorst: "To the Bill. Those are the concerns that we have is the use of the word detain. I would have some concerns about that language remaining. With the Sponsor's statement that there will be a concurrence, I remove my opposition."
- Speaker Willis: "Okay. Having heard one for and one against, Representative Kifowit to close, please."
- Kifowit: "I thank the Body for your consideration of this Bill.

  The family thanks the Body for consideration of this Bill.

  And I ask for your support."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2627 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting in 'favor', 33 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 20, House Bill 2425, Representative Chesney. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2425, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Chesney."

Chesney: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members. House Bill 2425 provides an incentive for landowners to protect species before they become endangered by eliminating the duplication in processes for permitting. This Bill also improves the information provided to the public about federally listed endangered species. I suspect there might be a few questions. And I'd welcome that to the Body."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative, what is... where is the Fish and Wildlife on this Bill?

Chesney: "The Fish and Wildlife are in support. And this has been a longstanding... this has been a longstanding process for about four years that has... has cut across partisan lines and has been widely adopted. And there's seems to be no opposition to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife proposals in this particular measure."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Arroyo: "So I have a good relationship with the Fish and Wildlife. A couple of years... a couple of years ago I ran a Bill here in the General Assembly to protect the lion. And the lion... the lion now is an auspicious species in Washington. So we had to go to Washington and we worked with them. And now because here in Illinois they used to want to consume lion meat. So I worked with them and worked everybody in the Body here. And they actually helped here to be able to... to be able to make the lion into it the auspicious species list. But so are you looking to make... to put any certain animal or anybody or just whatever is in farmland?"

Chesney: "No, Representative. This... this Bill seeks to simply remove the duplication in processes. We'll protect all the endangered species, both listed federally and by the state. We are... this Bill seeks to proactively entice landowners to participate in this process. And I think it's very important to note to the Body, this is an optional program that is not paid. So the people that enter this program do not receive compensation. So there is no direct or indirect effort to avert any regulations or any proposals to go after any of the endangered species federally or state listed."

Arroyo: "So if the Fish and Wildlife is for this Bill. I am sure for this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good Bill. Support this Bill. And I hope everybody votes 'yes'. Thank you."

Chesney: "Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Willis, do you rise... I'm sorry, Williams. I can go... I know... been up here a while.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Representative Williams, do you rise in opposition to the Bill?"

Williams, A.: "Yes, Leader Willis."

Speaker Willis: "You are recognized."

Williams, A.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

- Williams, A.: "Representative, do you have a position from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources on this Bill?"
- Chesney: "I do. Right now they are presently opposed. Last night we were in anticipation for a memorandum of understanding that says that there is no duplication of process and perhaps this could be worked out. I'm committed to working this out through the entire process. It did not have opposition when it was presented by Representative Costello in the 101st... 100th General Assembly. It reached opposition under this particular IDNR, but we're committed to removing that opposition, if possible, as it moves through the process."
- Williams, A.: "Wonder why that would be? With regard to Cook County, the Forest Preserve have you heard from them as well about position?"
- Chesney: "I have not... I have not spoken directly in opposition with them. No."
- Williams, A.: "Okay. It's my understanding that the Cook County Forest Preserve is also opposed. To the Bill. My concern about this Bill is that we are going to be relying on federal standards to interpret the danger of any particular species and when... whether they are endangered or not. My concern there is they are looking at holistically as an entire country. And while that may make sense in some circumstances, we need to

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

look at what states specifically species are doing in terms of thriving and growing here in Illinois. We have certainly so many amazing natural resources to preserve and protect. I don't think now is the time to go along with what they're doing on the federal level, which is deregulating opportunities to make sure we keep our environment clean, keep our endangered species healthy, thriving, and growing. So I would urge... this Bill is... this Bill contains more concerns than meet the eye. Please take a look at what we're really doing here. And if we are in fact damaging our incredible natural resources here in Illinois. I'll be voting 'no' and I urge you to do the same."

- Speaker Willis: "This Bill was on Short Debate. Having heard one opposed and one for, Representative Chesney to close, please."
- Chesney: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I appreciate all of the bipartisan agreements and all of the work that has been done on the other side of the aisle to reach a compromise. What we have done... and we've worked with the IDNR, and we've worked in good faith to accomplish a number of things, and we've removed a lot of provisions that prevented it to move forward in the last General Assembly. I would humbly ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2425 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting in 'favor', 47 voting 'against', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 22 of the Calendar, Representative Manley for House Bill 3503. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3503, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Manley on the Bill."

Manley: "Thank you, Leader Willis. This Bill requires that health insurers offer consumers the option to purchase supplemental hearing aid coverage. This Bill explicitly states that it does not preclude insureds from purchasing more expensive hearing aids than those covered under... under their plan. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Real quick, Representative. Opponents, where are they with the final Amendment?"

Manley: "So I do have an opponent from the Coalition of Insured Agents and Brokers. I have a statement that I asked them to prepare because... well let me just read it. 'We applaud you on the intent of this legislation.' I want to focus on that part. We want to applaud you for the intent of your legislation. Let that sink in. Okay. Thank you. However... don't ignore the rest of this. We must be opposed because the legislation calls for a mandatory offer of coverage be made by our agents and brokers. Mandatory offers have the potential to expose our agents and brokers to professional liability claims and can be difficult to disprove. We appreciate...' again, focus on this... 'We appreciate you taking the time to listen to our

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

concerns.' So it's been... it's been a long road for this Bill. I had this Bill last Session. There are... and it's evolved to a point. But I want to tell you it started with my own mother. And the fact that hearing aids, not only for her but for all people, all ages are extremely expensive. And I'm... I'm inviting people to get involved in this because it's important to a lot of people. It was just older people. Because of somebody who is... who all of us know, I was asked to expand it to all ages. And so I've done that. And it's been a long road. I got the life... Illinois Life Insurance Council with me. I listened to them, addressed their issues. And the only opposition I couldn't remove was the one that I said earlier."

Batinick: "Okay. Well... well thank you for that. And that was my clarifying question that you so eloquently answered. So there was seven, eight groups in opposition and you got that down to one. Is that correct, Representative?

Manley: "I'm busy getting Sponsors on my Bill Representative."

Batinick: "Good theater for it."

Manley: "Yeah. I'm sorry, go ahead... I'm sorry."

Batinick: "You got rid of a lot of opponents except for one, correct?"

Manley: "Oh, yes. Yes, I can't even tell you how... this has like rejuvenated my belief in this system. That if you work with people and you address their issues and you invite them to the table, you can achieve great things. And I think this Bill is an indicator of that."

Batinick: "Do you... do you recall how I voted for this Bill in committee, Representative?"

Manley: "I think... I think you liked it."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Batinick: "Yeah. Okay."

Manley: "Do you want to be chief-co?"

Batinick: "Thank you for answering my questions."

Manley: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Manley, I appreciate and applaud you, and give you a chance to close."

Manley: "Please vote 'yes'. Thank you very much."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3503 pass?'
All in favor vote' aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davis in the Chair."

Speaker Davis: "House Bill 840, Representative Mason. Is
Representative Mason in the chamber? Out of the record. House
Bill 3424, Representative Meyers-Martin. Representative
Meyers-Martin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3424, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Meyers-Martin."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. House Bill 3424 creates a 15 member Veterans' Disability Compensation Task Force. These 15 members shall be comprised of different Illinois Counties Veterans' Assistance Commissions. The task force will assess compensation disparities for Illinois veterans and report their findings and recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly no later than July 1, 2020 and shall be

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

repealed on July 1, 2021. There is no opposition to that as far as I know."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3424 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Buckner, Jones, Mason, Tarver, Villanueva. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 471, Representative Morgan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 471, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. This... Mr. Speaker, this is a consumer protection Bill. So this Bill, House Bill 471, this is a consumer protection Bill. It gives health insurance rate approval to the Illinois Department of Insurance for the first time. The Illinois Department of Insurance whose mission is to provide protection for consumers. This is a negotiated Bill that is supported by health care advocates. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois is neutral on this Bill. And it will bring us in line as a state with 37 other states in the country that have rate review authority, rate approval for health insurance increases. Specifically this Bill does two primary things. It provides the Department of Insurance with the ability to reject health insurance increases throughout the state that are excessive, that create unnecessary profit for insurance carriers, or are discriminatory. Second, it

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

provides new transparency requirements. So that consumers throughout the State of Illinois will see on the Department of Insurance's website when there's a new rate increase. The volatility of 50, 60, 80, 90 percent increases for health insurance throughout the state have left us all shaken. And on an annual basis individuals, families, and small businesses are struggling to keep up with these increases. Rate approval authority will reduce the health care and health insurance costs throughout the State of Illinois. I ask you to stand with working families in Illinois, not widening insurance profits. Vote 'yes' to support small businesses and fight back against sky high rate increases. Let's pass this consumer protection Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Brady, for what reason do you rise?"

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Brady: "Representative, first off, I know you've worked very hard on this piece of legislation and have been back and forth with many Amendments and back and forth and in and out of committee. What I have... my first question about is the authorization side of things with the Department of Insurance. And we're asking that department to actually go into the marketplace, correct? If I understand your Bill correctly, the free marketplace. And we're asking them to regulate the rates and approve or disapprove increases or the rates overall for insurance in the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- "Not exactly. Right now the Illinois Department of Morgan: Insurance, on an annual basis, receives a lot of information from every health insurance carrier in Illinois. That review of information includes a lot of information and details about how an insurance carrier gets to those rates. So the Department of Insurance today reviews this information. They do it every year, all the time, and they've done it for a number of years. The only difference is the Illinois Department of Insurance does not have the ability to reject a rate... a rate increase. Right now we're what's called a file and use state. Which means the insurance carriers can provide an increase of 100, 200, 500 percent and the Illinois Department of Insurance and the State of Illinois can do nothing about it. So this provides the Department of Insurance the authority to reject those increases."
- Brady: "Okay. If I understand correctly then presently, right now with the insurers and the chamber and others that are opposed, do you have more that you could mention that I just didn't cover? There... there seems to be several insurers that are still opposed even with the Amendments. The chamber... is that what you reflect with your discussions? You've talked numerous times with these individuals and these associations, I'm assuming."
- Morgan: "That's correct. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Illinois, again, is neutral on this Bill. But there are insurance carriers that are still opposed. That's correct."
- Brady: "So is there not a belief that by... by doing this that there's also we're creating what's already in statute, with

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

really duplicating a process of the Department of Insurance current authority that they presently have. Is that..."

Morgan: "There's no concern that I'm aware of..."

Brady: "...your intent?"

Morgan: "Oh, forgive me. Go ahead, finish your question."

Brady: "No... I just... with the Bill is that your intent? There seems to be some overriding authority already there. You're expanding that if I'm understanding the Bill correctly."

Morgan: "There's no duplication of authority. This takes the existing authority of the Department of Insurance that reviews the rate increases on an annual basis. It gives the Department of Insurance a new authority to reject increases that are too large or excessive or discriminatory."

Brady: "And can you speak then to the Amendment... and I'm not... I'm not sure which one that was... that would incorporate the federal definition of what's unreasonable rate increases and then the time limits that's set under your Bill?"

Morgan: "Absolutely. House Amendment 2, which this chamber approved yesterday, dealt with several items and we discussed this a little bit in committee. But the definition of what unreasonable is. And... and to make it simple, to make it consistent with what insurance carriers deal with across the country we're using the definition of unreasonableness that is in Federal Law. Deals with those that are excessive profits based on the market. Those that are discriminatory in charging insurance rate increases that don't reflect the comparable insurance pool. So we're relying on the federal definition. Again, it's applied throughout the country. Insurance carriers today, many in Illinois that operate in other states

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

are accustomed and consistently respond to those definitions."

Brady: "And in your Bill, if I... if I follow it correctly here, there's also a provision in which the department disapproving a rate increase or change for a carrier that that carrier would have to more or less on the policies and on the information regarding what policies have more or less a stamp of disapproval, a scarlet letter, whatever the case may be that this did not meet with the approval of the Department of Insurance. And that, therefore, would have to be carried out through the company for their policies. Is that correct?"

Morgan: "I'm so sorry. Are you asking the question of whether or not today you could have a disapproval?"

Brady: "We... we can. What I'm asking is what does your particular piece of legislation change on that?"

Morgan: "Yes. So... so this legislation would specifically give the Department of Insurance the ability to reject a rate increase and go back to the insurance carrier. And to your earlier question about timing, this was just something that I discussed with the Department of Insurance and all the insurance carriers that were represented in the state and through the Insurance Committee to make sure that there was a reasonable period of times that if a rate was rejected they still have the ability to fix that so that they have the insurance rates and carrier insurance plans going on an annual basis. So it doesn't disrupt the market in other words. So currently we use in my legislation it's a 60 day period of time. Depending on how things go, sometimes it's a little bit sooner than that. There's a federal approval of those rates

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

and timing involved with that. But generally speaking the 60 day window fits within what is generally done today without those rejection of rates."

Brady: "Thank you for that. I'm not sure I'm clear on the timeframe in which the department would have to make this review under your legislation. But specifically to the opponents. And I know I... how many Amendments have you tried to pass and put on the legislation? How many are you up to?"

Morgan: "This is... this is there was an original Bill. This is the third Amendment on the Bill."

Brady: "Okay. All right a third Amendment. And that third Amendment has not removed a fair amount of the industries opposition to the Bill is my understanding. Is that a fair statement?"

Morgan: "I would disagree. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois is over 60 percent of the market. So when we look at what the impact is on insurance and insurance carriers in Illinois Blue Cross Blue Shield, as many of us know, is really the predominant market force in Illinois with health insurance. And they are neutral. So while there might be a number of insurance carriers that have an opposition, the vast majority of the market right now is neutral."

Brady: "Then... the number... large number of insurance carriers still have an opposition to it. That's a fair statement?"

Morgan: "That is fair."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Brady: "This... this Bill has been worked on by the Sponsor. And I appreciate those efforts. But there still is, within the industry, major concerns with the legislation in opposition. And maybe that has potential to be worked out someday or not. I don't know. But going into the marketplace and changing what has been a practice that has served, I think, Illinois well. Illinois business insurance and those that they provide policies for... for the consumers themselves, I believe, is not something in the best interest to disrupt and change at this point. And I would simply intend to vote 'no' on the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Morgan, close."

Morgan: "Thank you everybody for your weigh in on this. In the Insurance Committee and the Insurance Chairman who worked very closely with me to try and find a negotiation and agreement on this Bill. This is an issue that has been in front of this chamber in the past. This is a rate review approval that, again, is allowed in 37 other states and on average reduces in about 10 percent reduction. A 10 percent reduction in the cost of health insurance coverage in insurance carriers throughout the state. That is real dollars in people's pockets. As we deal with 20, 30, 50 percent increases on an annual basis. We talk all the time about the impact on families, and small businesses. This is your opportunity to reduce their cost. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 471 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. The
vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke. DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 73 Members voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3334, Representative Rita. Representative Rita, House Bill 3334. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3334, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3334 is a Bill that will allow organizations to conduct statewide raffles. It also... allows OTB, off-track betting sites, to have the same requirements for putting an OTB... a new OTB, the same requirements as the VGTs the video gaming facilities or video gaming cafes."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Connor, for what reason do you rise?"

Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just ask the record to reflect it was my intention to vote 'no' on House Bill 2425."

Speaker Davis: "The record will so reflect. Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3334 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bristow. Carroll. Morrison. Sommer. Walsh. Windhorst. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 81, Representative Scherer. Representative Scherer. Out of the record. House

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bill 1613, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1613, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1613 makes permanent the Illinois Traffic and Pedestrian Stop Statistical Study Act of 2003 permanent. Since 2004 the Act has required all law enforcement officers in Illinois to document data on traffic stops, including the race of the motorist and the outcome of the stop, as well as consent searches, dog sniff searches, and pedestrian stops. As our state sees on average 2 million stops per year the goal of this initiative is to remain transparency in police stops and to ensure that these stops are fair and bias free. And this initiative reflects our state's strong commitment and efforts to continually improve community and police relations. When we think about fighting against racial profiling we know that data collection analysis remains as a very important tool in identifying racial disparities. And equally important these can result in the review of policies and training and can lead to the implementation of practices that prevent bias policing. We added House Floor Amendment #1 to clarify the creation of a task force that would be convened by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority to review how the data is used and collected. It will offer recommendations every three years to ensure we continue to collect and analyze the data in the most effective way. It's important to note that there's no uniform law enforcement

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

position on the Bill. Let's pass this important piece of legislation. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Thank you, Representative. Members, this Bill is on Short Debate. One speaking in favor, that's the Bill Sponsor, and one speaking opposed. Representative Bryant, for what reason do you rise?"

Bryant: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I would like to ask for Standard Debate."

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate."

Bryant: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Bryant: "Thank you. Representative, we asked in committee for two things. Those who were opposing this Bill... two that I can think of. One was that you not remove the sunset on this, but you actually extend it for another period of time. Does this Bill remove the sunset?"

Slaughter: "Well, yeah. This ends and the sunset was removed."

Bryant: "Correct. And then secondly we're asked... asked about adding a line on this question that allowed for the race of the police officer or the person that's doing the... getting the information, if that would be added as well. So that in the study we're not just looking at who's... who is committing the offense but also who's actually making the stop. Has... has that line been added?"

Slaughter: "Well, right. And the Amendment added the task force that would be taken into account what you're asking."

Bryant: "Right but... but the sunset is still removed though, right? Slaughter: "Yes. That's accurate."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Bryant: "So even though the task force is there, they're not going to be really looking at this and then we can... can like fix this stuff later? The sunset is being removed forever?"
- Slaughter: "Right. That... that's accurate. Information Criminal Justice Authority will be convening the task force every three years. We were going to have a report on how the... the information is collected and analyzed."
- Bryant: "Yeah. So the task force is going to report. But is the task force going to address any of the issues that were brought up in committee? And is there a commitment from that task force to fix these issues?"
- Slaughter: "Yes. The task force is going to be looking at the issues that were brought up in committee. Yes."
- Bryant: "Okay. With... with the removal of the sunset, I... I don't think that most of us on this side are going to be able to get there. So that being said, I'll just speak to the Bill."

  Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."
- Bryant: "I understand what the Sponsor is trying to do with this.

  I think we could get there if the sunset was not removed. But with removing the sunset at this point, I would urge an 'aye' vote. I'm sorry, a 'no' vote. Urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Ammons. Representative, for what reason do you rise?"
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this initiative by Representative Slaughter. And want to speak to the Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."
- Ammons: "Thank you. First and foremost, let me just say that I thank our former Senate and former President of the United

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

States as a Senator that really responded to issues that were arising across the state. Certainly from black communities felt at the time that they were being disproportionately compared to other drivers in the State of Illinois. Prior to the Traffic Stop Data Bill that President Obama did as a Senator, this was just a feeling and there was no data collection to prove what the feeling was producing. As we worked on this... as he passed that piece of legislation which was historic, communities across the ... across the state had to begin to collect this data from the police departments. And I was a city council member at the time that this became effective. And I just want to share a little bit information for the City of Urbana where I served as an alderman. The Urbana Traffic Stop Data Task Force was formed in October... October 2015. And part of the work of Urbana where we recognized that there were many things that were happening to our community members but we wanted to quantify them. We wanted to take the report that came back to our community from our Illinois Department State Police and we wanted to put it into a task force in our community to address several things. I'm very happy that our Chairman Slaughter has brought this Bill back because removing the sunset is an important part of this process so that it doesn't have to be done every single year or every two years to continue to collect the data that identifies a few things that our community members were telling us that was happening. One of them was a need for us to survey a wider... a wider group of people that were being affected by traffic stops and racial disparities. We also wanted to analyze and... the collected statistics

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

regarding traffic stops. In order to look for those racial disparities and possible solutions to them. The data that was collected by our State Police... from our communities across the state was so critical in us doing the work that we did in the City of Urbana. We also looked to review current police procedures and how the police engage with the community. And as Representative Slaughter said, this is a very important Bill to address community and police relations because now we are documenting what is happening in communities across the state. And so, for those who may not understand how valuable this service is that we collect this data, it is important not only for us to collect it continuously, but it also helps lend to good policy at the local level. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Andrade, for what reason do you rise?"

Andrade: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Andrade: "Representative, I have a question. The Representative from the other aisle asked a question and I don't think I understood the answer. Will the form... will the form that the police officer use will that have the race of the police officer on it?"

Slaughter: "Okay. Thanks for the question, Representative. We're not changing the form. We... the form we've used for the last 14 years is the form that we're going to use."

Andrade: "I know. So the answer is, no?"

Slaughter: "The answer is, no."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Andrade: "Okay, so we don't know what race the officer is.

  Secondly, does... does it take into account the... where the police officer is working in the district? If it's predominantly a 99 percent Latino neighborhood, 99 percent African American neighborhood, 99 percent..."
- Slaughter: "It does. It does. There's benchmarking in... in that and it does take that into account. And again, the task force, one of the objectives of it is to tease out some of these questions."
- Andrade: "Right. But the task force... will the task force have the ability to change the form? They can change the form?"
- Slaughter: "Excuse me?"
- Andrade: "So the task force has the ability to change the form?

  Or..."
- Slaughter: "It can give that recommendation."
- Andrade: "So only... but only the General Assembly can change the form? I'm asking."
- Slaughter: "The local police department can change the form if they want to."
- Andrade: "Oh... oh okay. So they... that form is not... we don't... we're not the ones that say exactly what's on the form?"
- Slaughter: "That's correct."
- Andrade: "It's the local department if they want to can change and put the race of the police officer on there?"
- Slaughter: "That's correct. I mean we... we specify certain things but they can add certain things to the form if they want to."
- Andrade: "Okay. All right so they don't need our permission, right?"
- Slaughter: "Correct."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Andrade: "Okay. I just wanted to make sure that's clear and that's in the record. That the department if they want to they can add the form... the race of the police officer."

Slaughter: "That's... that's correct."

Andrade: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Cabello, for what reason do you rise?"

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Cabello: "Representative, we've had some very good conversations on this and I'm supporting of this. The couple of issues that I have is that it... it makes it forever. And can you tell how much it costs a year to collect this information?"

Slaughter: "We can't give... give me one second, Representative.

Approximately 160 thousand... each year to do this... to do this study."

Cabello: "And how much do we actually pay the person compiling the... the statistics?"

Slaughter: "One more time, Representative."

Cabello: "How much do we actually... how much is the contract that IDOT has with, I believe, the Illinois State University?"

Slaughter: "The contract is 168,000 a year. Eighty percent of that would be reimbursed by the feds. The other 20 percent, we're talking about \$33,600, would be matched by the state."

Cabello: "I think there's a little bit more to that. But I'll take..."

Slaughter: "No, there was a fiscal note filed on the Bill. We're reading what came back."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Cabello: "I'll ... I'll take your word for it. I'll take your word for it."

Slaughter: "Okay, thanks."

Cabello: "Can you tell me what has actually changed law enforcement's habits because of this?"

Slaughter: "Well it all depends. Representative Ammons just explained what happened in communities like Urbana, actually right here in Springfield. This has spurred on positive engagement from both the community and law enforcement to talk about addressing racial disparities in these... in these situations. It has improved community and police relations."

Cabello: "So can you tell me how long it takes to fill out one of these forms on a traffic stop?"

Slaughter: "No."

Cabello: "To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Cabello: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good idea. And I believe that it should be extended for maybe 10 years. And then we should take a look at it again. And if the Sponsor is willing to do that, I would sign on as a chief cosponsor. Here's the issues that I have with it going on forever. Number one, when we pull somebody over these folks are wanting to get out in a timely manner. This actually, along with all of the other paper work that we have started putting onto the police officers, have now made a simple 5 minute traffic stop into 25 minutes. So we are holding people because we have to do all of this paperwork. Now another thing that nobody can tell me is if I'm running radar at midnight and I pull the vehicle over, when I fill out this traffic stop information it asks

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

me what I perceived that the race was of the person that I'm pulling over. I have no idea. So now they're telling us, well then you have to put it down after you recognize what race they are. Well that makes this whole thing flawed. That makes everything that the data collection that's coming in flawed. Because now we're telling the law enforcement one thing, then we're demanding them to do another. Again Representative, if we could change this in the Senate to be 10 years, I'd love to be a chief-co. Otherwise, I think we have some more work to do on this. And I'm willing to work with you, but then I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter to close."

Slaughter: "It's really interesting. You know, last week we passed a Bill regarding collecting data on the gang database. That seemed to fit into the job description of our law enforcement departments. But when it comes to this, and we're looking at increasing transparency, there seems to be issues with this sort of data collection, where we want to shed light on racial disparities. It's important that we look at this long term. You know, some departments have done a great job in addressing this through this initiative. But we also see inconsistent data in regards to this increasing and decreasing. We need a long term view of how this plays out in regards to these traffic stops. Seventeen other states I know do this. Out of the seventeen, fifteen of those states have a permanent data collection clause. I think it's important that we continue to respect law enforcement. But as we move forward with criminal justice reform, it's equally important that we look at these

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

racial biases and racial profiling situations. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1613 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Demmer, Hurley, Spain, Wehrli, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 75 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2165, Representative Murphy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2165, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you very much. This Bill is an initiative from a constituent who's a high school principal in my district. And it would require each student entering ninth grade to successfully complete three years of mathematics. One must be Algebra I and one must include geometry content. This will allow the school district to have more opportunities for students to take real world math classes by creating different path... pathways to satisfy the geometry requirement. Three years of math would still be required but the school district would have flexibility to determine what three years of math that might include. It's got support from the Illinois Statewide School Management Alliance, the Illinois High School District Organizations of Chicago Public Schools, and other educational organizations. The Illinois Federation of Teachers and Illinois Education Associations are fine with

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

the Bill after the Amendment. And speaking of the Amendment, I have to thank Representative Stuart. She worked with me very hard on this Bill. And I'm very happy to say that I think we've got a great Bill and I think it could help some kids. I urge an 'aye' vote and I welcome any questions."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mayfield, for what reason do you rise?"

Mayfield: "I have a question. I'm not sure if I'm opposed or for it. My question is, does this apply to students with IEPs?"

Speaker Davis: "The Sponsor will yield."

Murphy: "Yes."

Mayfield: "Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? Does this apply to students with IEPs? Because that's not in this language. It says all students. So I want to know if we have a student with an IEP that may require special education or additional assistance. They aren't taking Algebra I and geometry. So we're requiring our special education students to take algebra and geometry?"

Murphy: "This would not remove anything that was allowing that to happen prior to."

Mayfield: "Okay, but it says that..."

Murphy: "If they were allowed not to... if their IEP allowed them not to take the algebra and geometry prior to this Bill. This would not keep them from... that from happening."

Mayfield: "Okay, but it wasn't required before. Your language specifically says that you're requiring them to take it."

Murphy: "This... the language before said that they were required to take algebra and geometry."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Mayfield: "No, that... that's what your language says. Unless I'm reading the analysis wrong, your Bill says that this requires students to take Algebra I and at least one other course that must include geometry content. So you are requiring algebra and geometry for all high school students. That's what your language says."

Murphy: "That... that is what..."

Mayfield: "You're mandating... you're mandating."

Murphy: "That is... that is what the requirement was prior to. Now we're saying that they can take a class with geometry content in it, not just a geometry class."

Mayfield: "Okay. Again, you are mandating. This is an unfunded mandate. That you are requiring students with IEPs and that are in special education to take algebra and geometry..."

Murphy: "I do not believe that's the case."

Mayfield: "...to graduate."

Murphy: "This... this is just changing what was already there. Saying they had to take algebra before. This is not a new mandate. This... this is just changing what was there."

Mayfield: "Okay. Your... your, I'm sorry your language in the Bill is not clear."

Murphy: "It... it is definitely easing the mandate. It is not making the mandate more restrictive."

Mayfield: "No. It's still a mandate regardless of how you frame it."

Murphy: "The mandate was there prior."

Mayfield: "Okay. But you're still... you're reframing a mandate.

It's still a mandate. A mandate is a mandate. You can't dress

up a pig and not call it a pig. It's still a mandate."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Murphy: "It... it was a hard mandate now we're trying to ease that mandate. We... we are not adding an additional mandate."

Mayfield: "Okay, but it's still a mandate."

Murphy: "Well it was a mandate prior to."

Mayfield: "To the Bill. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Mayfield: "To the Bill. I just think this Bill is not well worded. I understand your intent. I just think there's an issue with the wording and the actual language. And that this Bill could negatively affect students with IEPs and with... that may be in special education. I would ask either that the Speaker pull the Bill from the record, work with... or give a promise on the floor to work with the Senate Sponsor to clarify the language regarding special ed and IEPs. Other than that I'd ask for an 'aye'... a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stuart, for what reason do you rise?"

Stuart: "I... just attempt to clarify a little bit. First, I want to thank Representative Murphy for bringing this forward."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Stuart: "And I just want to point out prior to this our current statute says students must take one... for all that... to graduate they have to take three years of mathematics. One must be Algebra I, one must be geometry, and the other could be Algebra II or the only replacement for Algebra II is AP computer science. So what this is doing is it's keeping the Algebra I. It's keeping the geometry. It's making that third year more flexible. So any exclusions that were in place for special education students prior will still be in place now.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

So it will not... so those IEPs can still be met for those students. And I think that what this actually does, like Representative Murphy said, this lessens a mandate. It gives more opportunities. So we allowed for Algebra II or AP computer science. This opens the door to a non AP computer science course that a school can do. This is going to help our students be able to be... we'll have a higher successful graduation rate because it's that third year math class that has hurt so many students. And many students report that what causes them to drop out of school is the fact that they cannot complete that third year math course. So, I think this is going to be very helpful for a lot of our students."

Speaker Davis: "Thank you for the clarification. Representative Bourne, for what reason do you rise?"

Bourne: "I have a question for legislative intent."

Speaker Davis: "Sponsor will yield."

Bourne: "Representative Murphy, is it your intention that this will maintain the same exceptions for students with IEPs as what's in the current statute today?"

Murphy: "That's... that's correct."

Bourne: "And it's your intention that this will be mandate relief for school districts who are currently required to have students complete an extra math class? This will allow them to complete an applied math class, which is more in alignment with career and tech education and that track in high school."

Murphy: "That's absolutely correct."

Bourne: "I think that just to clarify the Bill, this is about relieving mandates in classrooms. It's about giving more flexibility for students to take coursework that is in

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- alignment with their needs for their career path. I think this is a great Bill. Thank you for working so hard to make this an agreed Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Murphy to close."
- Murphy: "Thank you very much. This is not an additional mandate.

  It is actually easing a mandate like so many speakers have said. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2165 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
  The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Didech. Scherer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2565, Representative Stava-Murray. Mr... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2565, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Mr. Clerk, Third Reading. And read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2565, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Stava-Murray."
- Stava-Murray: "Thank you. So this is a Bill, 2565... actually... so this is a Bill that we were actually just discussing. And so, there are a couple of Amendments that are in process that I...

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

are going to be considered for this. But this is a Bill that essentially gives the Freedom to Work for all employees. So currently right now we have the Freedom to Work for just some employees. So low wage workers. And the ... essentially what happens is that if someone has a non-compete clause or covenant in their... in their contract, which is often done at the beginning of workers, they are not allowed to go to another employer, certain type of employer, or in a certain geographical region for a certain period of time. And there's a real issue with the way that these types of covenants are used. They're often times not very enforceable in the State of Illinois. And the biggest issue is that they're used as a bully tactic to keep people from leaving an employer. And a person in my life had a very significant experience where they had a non-compete that was... what was considered a reasonable period of time but they weren't allowed to have an income if they were to leave their employer. And they realized after they had signed that. And once they got to the company that their boss was a serial sexual harasser. And so, they actually ended up in that job for five years. And it was very, very difficult to exit. And so, the idea behind this is that any day requiring that people cannot pay for their child care or cannot pay for food on their table because they have worked for a certain employer is very, very unfair. So this makes that process illegal. And I have an Amendment that I've been talking to... or that is the intent is that there will be a vote of concurrence on this after it goes to the Senate. That carves out and makes an exception for if people move to another company that they can't poach clients essentially. So

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

they are not allowed to work with the same set of clients. Because one of the biggest issues I heard from the business community is that you don't want to lose clients. So I'm sensitive to that and we're working on some language there to hopefully neutralize some of the opposition there. But I urge an 'aye' vote. Because there's many, many people who are being bullied by this currently who may not want to come forward about their harassment that they receive. And it's important that people have the freedom to use their skills and talents to earn an income."

Speaker Davis: "This Bill being on Short Debate, Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you rise in favor or opposition?"

Wheeler: "Thanks. Can we go to Standard Debate, please?"

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Wheeler: "Representative, we had a discussion about this in committee. We didn't get to have a very long one due to the schedule we had that night. But I want to go back and kind of put things in context as to where we were the last time we addressed this issue to my knowledge on the House Floor here, which was when we applied this in restriction of non-competes to people who make under \$13 an hour. I know it's kind of in reference to sandwich makers who were not being able to move from employer to employer at their will. And I think that got really good bipartisan support. And we... you know, we appreciate that part of it. But then the Bill you presented now effectively extends that to every level of income. Is that... do I have that right?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Stava-Murray: "Exactly. And I think the difference between the last time this came forward and now is the #MeToo movement. And so, what we see is that overwhelmingly there's a large amount of sexual harassment that occurs in the workplace. And this is also not inclusive of but there's also racial harassment that happens in the workplace. And when people are being harassed in the workplace they may or may not want to report that. So the suggestion was made, so why not carve out just sexual harassment if someone reports it? Well the facts are clear that there's large amounts of retaliation in the workplace as well. So if people want to just move on with their life. They should have the ability, no matter what their paycheck is, to be able to use their skills and talents to earn an income."
- Wheeler: "At the same time there are repercussions that you had outlined a little bit in your opening statement. That there are potentially unintended consequences that come along with that. The... the idea of eliminating for everyone. You know I think we presented an idea very briefly at the committee level of addressing that like you said."
- Stava-Murray: "So the Amendment... do you want to hear the Amendment that I have... I have briefly proposing?"
- Wheeler: "Well I wish... I wish you could have filed the Amendment now and we can vote on the Amendment rather than just wishing for it."

Stava-Murray: "I wish we didn't have deadlines, too. Right?" Wheeler: "I know."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Stava-Murray: "So this is... so it says basically that restricts... so this is giving the ability to still have non-solicitation clauses."

Wheeler: "Right. But that's... that's a separate thing."

Stava-Murray: "Yeah."

Wheeler: "Non-compete..."

Stava-Murray: "Correct. I know it's separate. So this is saying that someone can go to work for another employer but they can't solicit."

Wheeler: "Agreed. But then remember that if you're in... like let's use tech as an example because that's something I'm really familiar with. If I have trade secrets about a project that's being launched soon or that's being developed and evolved. I go to another employer, regardless of the situation, I am still taking information with me that is going to be harmful back to my previous employer."

Stava-Murray: "Did you sign an NDA?"

Wheeler: "What's that?"

Stava-Murray: "Isn't that what an NDA is for?"

Wheeler: "If you're non-disclosure agreement?"

Stava-Murray: "And trade secrets if you're stealing intellectual property. Isn't that a different issue than..."

Wheeler: "You're not stealing them. Because... when you have... the reason why you have a non-compete is because there's other things besides the trade secrets themselves that are also going to give the new employer an advantage. So that's why a lot of companies go that route."

Stava-Murray: "So I... I understand that it's designed to prevent that. And yet, we're... so we're... this is one of the only cases

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

where in order to prevent a perceived crime we're penalizing people by saying they cannot earn an income. And to me that's distinctly un-American to say you're guilty before you've committed a crime."

Wheeler: "Let's go back... to address... I'm not sure that your Bill, the way I'm reading the Bill, actually addresses that situation. Now if we were to look at the specific instances that you're bringing up and write language that addresses those situations, I think you'd find bipartisan for that. I don't however that this kind of overly broad approach necessarily stops it where you want it to stop. And I think that this is an effect on the business community that will... and some workers who won't get hired here in the first place that we're going to have to be aware of. So I can understand the idea of the non-solicitation, that's an important element of it. But I think addressing the actual issue itself may be where we want to go to try and actually solve this problem. And I understand if... you know it to be a problem more than I do. I'd like to learn more about it and see how I can help you."

Stava-Murray: "Yeah and the tech community is a particularly egregious offender when we're talking about tech. When it comes to harassment and sexual harassment in the workplace, it is one of the worst industries in terms of harassment. There's a personal story that I know about a woman who's tech... startup tech founder had \$40 billion or whatever..."

Wheeler: "Right. But this doesn't just apply to tech it applies..."

Stava-Murray: "...tons of money. But this is... so this is... but you're saying that the tech industry especially needs these non-

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

competes. And I'm saying that the tech industry, as one of the worst offenders, especially needs to allow the freedom of work for their employees."

Wheeler: "Okay. Well I'll... I'll go out of my way to say that while I'm involved in that industry when I'm not in this chamber, I... I don't have any direct understanding of that ever happening in my experience. So I can't speak to that the way that you can based on the research you've done. But I don't think we should single out tech necessarily. If you say it's broader than tech, then maybe it is. We aren't really addressing that issue with what your Bill does. It wipes out all non-competes at every level for everybody in the state."

Stava-Murray: "One... one of the biggest things that people say when someone says I was sexually harassed at work, the first thing that is said is, why didn't you leave? And the answer is..."

Wheeler: "Why didn't you file a complaint, right?"

Stava-Murray: "...more commonly than not a non-compete. Why didn't you leave a non-compete? Because I couldn't pay my child care if I left this job. Because I thought that I was going to have... because I have worked too darn hard to have this man take down my career..."

Wheeler: "Representative..."

Stava-Murray: "...and I didn't have another option to work."

Wheeler: "...I understand your... your reasoning."

Stava-Murray: "So it does directly... it does directly attack the issue."

Wheeler: "Right. But can't we... can't we apply a waiver that would say, via legislative language, to say that if there is a

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- situation such as you've mentioned here that that would dissolve the non-compete in that instance?"
- Stava-Murray: "I don't think we can because then we're forcing people who are going through sexual harassment in the workplace to report. And what we know is that when people report in the workplace, there's a large amount of retaliation in the workplace."
- Wheeler: "Okay... okay, but..."
- Stava-Murray: "And... and trust me I wish that there were a way where we didn't have to force people to report to dissolve a non-compete."
- Wheeler: "Tell me... tell me has another state gone this route and eliminated non-competes entirely?"
- Stava-Murray: "I haven't seen an example yet."
- Wheeler: "I can't... I don't think there's one in our analysis of anything along those lines of another state that's actually done this."
- Stava-Murray: "Now we do often worry about businesses leaving Illinois. People may want to move to Illinois to not have their non-compete applicable. So we may have an influx of skilled workers as well."
- Wheeler: "Well, I don't think that... that may not apply the same way. I think when you have an employment contract it applies to the state you live. But again, Representative, this is a Bill that I understand your intention on. I would like to do two things with you... I'll just go to the Bill here. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's work that needs to be done..."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Wheeler: "...in Illinois with respect to our non-competes. The one thing we do need to do is update the... the Bill that I referred to before that protects people who make under \$13 an hour. As the minimum wage increases in our state, we don't have a mechanism for that non-compete threshold to go with it. We need to address that. At the same time I encourage the Sponsor to work with me and other Members of the Legislature here and the business community to find a way to more narrowly address what she's trying to accomplish here so it actually works the way she intends it to, to solve the problems that she understands to be there. This Bill is broadly written it goes beyond that, several measures beyond that. And at this point of time I, unfortunately, cannot support it the way it's written. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Halpin, for what reason do you rise? In favor or opposed?"
- Halpin: "Unfortunately opposed, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."
- Halpin: "So, Representative, when we first discussed this you had mentioned that motivation that harassers can use these agreements to kind of trap their victims in their job. Is that right?"
- Stava-Murray: "Yes, that's exactly what has happened."
- Halpin: "Yeah. And I... I definitely see that situation and I can imagine that happening. And... I acknowledge that that happens. At the time we had talked I did make a suggestion about amending the Bill, as the previous speaker had said, to void

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

any agreement where an employee found themselves in that situation. Did you look into making any Amendment like that?" Stava-Murray: "Yes. And to the point of the last speaker, it's problematic in several ways. And the first and foremost is that it forces someone to report their harassment. And so, a) that person may not want to report the harassment. It's very well documented that when harassment complaints are made that retaliation often ensues. And so, that person may be worried about their own reputation and not want to have to deal with the fall out of having to report. They may just want to move on with their life and find another job. But this non-compete clause does not allow for that. And furthermore, the second issue I see there is that before... before Roe v. Wade when rape occurred rapists would often say she just wants to get an abortion as a defense. So we were ... we would be giving sexual harassers a defense by them being able to say, she just wants to null and void this non-compete and that's why she's claiming it. And so, there's already a severe issue of people not believing those who are survivors of sexual harassment and assault. And so, I wouldn't want to make that any worse through an inclusion that a) forces someone to report that may not want to report, and b) then gives some credibility to some false allegations that they just want out of their non-compete."

Halpin: So what I... I guess what I would suggest is there's a way where they wouldn't have to report any harassment to their employer. But they could go bring their non-compete to their attorney and say, hey look... I'm going through this at work. If that's the case and I were to relocate and leave my job

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

and work for someone else, can we defeat this? And any attorney looking at the law, if we passed it that way would say yes. So she… he or she…"

Stava-Murray: "Would I have to pay that attorney though?"

Halpin: "If I could. If I could. So he or she could just leave.

And then if the employer ever tried to enforce that noncompete agreement then she would be able to respond... he or
she would be able to respond to that. And say no that... that
agreement is void based on what I experienced at the... at the
employer."

Stava-Murray: "No... no, I'm... I was never at the minimum wage level but I also don't have my own attorney. So would the person... the person would still require an attorney. So it's like they could go to their attorney and make it null and void but then they have to pay for an attorney."

Halpin: "So, I think we're beyond the minimum wage level. And I think..."

Stava-Murray: "Oh no, exactly. But what I mean is if someone's going to..."

Halpin: "I'll go to... I'll go to the Bill. I'll go to the Bill."
Stava-Murray: "Okay."

Halpin: "I don't think we're... I think it's fair to say that you know I've got a pretty strong pro... pro-employee voting record in this Body. And I really don't like speaking against Democratic Bills but I... I have to side with the opponents on this Bill mainly because this doesn't apply just to the minimum wage workers. If I had been in this chamber when we passed the original Freedom to Work I would have been a wholehearted supporter of it. Because I think it doesn't make

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

sense in the situations that we're trying to address in that Bill. But this Bill is using an axe when we really need a scalpel. This Bill is going to affect lawyers, accountants, the insurance industry, finance, tech industry, research, and medicine. And there are legitimate interests. And these... these non-competes are not always between, you know, management, you know, the boss and the lowest level employees. In some cases you're technically an employee but you're almost a near partner because you... you have a vested interest in the product or the technology that you're trying to develop. And firms take inherent risks when they hire these people. They entrust these people with highly confidential information, proprietary information in some cases. They can access customer lists. And these are all industries where customer contact is... is essential. Now I appreciate that the Sponsor has at least talked about an Amendment potentially in the Senate that addresses the customer list side but that's not the entire set of things that we're worried about here. And under these circumstances the employers that make these investments in their employees shouldn't have to face immediate competition from them if they... if they just decide to leave. And I'm absolutely sympathetic with the situation where employees being bullied by the non-compete agreement. But there are many, many cases where the employee is not being bullied. They want to go out and try to compete, make their own... take advantage of the employer that they've worked for and directly compete with them. And I... I don't think that's right. So I don't think we should throw the entire system out for this one problem, which I acknowledge is a problem. And

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

I... I don't want to get hyperbolic. You know, as ... as an attorney, I know that there are small firms throughout the state whether it's insurance or attorneys. They're not going to flee the state. They're going to... they're going to continue to operate. But there are some industries where they will think twice about whether or not they want to hire talent. Particularly in the tech industry. I was on the Governor's transition team for Economic Opportunity and we talked a lot about making Chicago a medical tech center. It had a lot of tech incubators and create a Midwest Silicon Valley type arrangement. Whatever you want to call it. But this Bill will make those efforts much harder. And I think there are any number of ways that we could amend this Bill to meet its goal without these adverse effects. And... and I'm happy to work with the Sponsor on that. But because I think the Sponsor has been on... not really expressed an interest in doing so I'd have to ask for a 'no' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Stava-Murray to close."

Stava-Murray: "So I think what's an interesting conversation that I had earlier on this exact Bill is around the topic of where we are at in terms of the... in terms of how we think about the... can I speak, please?... how we think about the world that we live in. And we are framing this now as whether or not these... this specific thing needs to be saved. But if the world that we lived was one where non-competes didn't exist, would we have enough reason to create this entity of non-compete to make it exist in the first place? With all of the problems that it creates. Would we not pick a different solution that

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

doesn't come along with it the inability for people to pay for child care, or for food for their table? No matter how much income that they make, a lot of people live paycheck to paycheck. And what we're doing is we're restricting people's freedom and the ability to use their talents that they have created. Now I understand that there is quite a bit of opposition to this Bill. And I'm willing to keep working together on the Amendments. And if there's some sort of inclusion for... I have the non-solicitation. There had been an idea that if there is a field of intense competition that there could be a... there could be a payment for the time that people are told that they are not allowed to work. And that's something I'm very willing to consider. And I'm committed to finding agreement with the Members of... of the caucus who have brought forth those concerns and going forward with the Senate Amendment that would, of course, be necessary. I'm sure it won't make it through the Senate if it's not amended as well. So with that commitment to work together, and the spirit of finding a solution that doesn't require someone to report their harassment that significantly changes this, I... I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2565 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Please, Members, vote your switches. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 37 Members voting 'yes', 62 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, not having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Bill 359, Representative Stuart. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. House Bill 359. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 359, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Stuart."
- Stuart: "Thank you. House Bill 359 simply allows our public institutions of higher education to sell surplus real estate.

  And then use the proceeds to go towards deferred maintenance or emergency use... emergency repair of institution property."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discretion... seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 359 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bristow. Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2400, Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, bring this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2400, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Turner, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Turner on Floor Amendment #1."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber. Floor Amendment #1 removes the provision allowing the Department of Corrections to discharge a participant from mandatory supervised release if they determine that he or she is likely

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

to remain at liberty without committing another offense.

That's being removed from the Bill. I'd ask for the adoption."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Bryant, for what reason do you rise?"

Bryant: "I rise in opposition of the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Well we need to adopt the Amendment. Can we adopt the Amendment?"

Bryant: "Certainly."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Turner moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2400, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber. House Bill 2400, as it stands, it creates the pathway to... excuse me, Pathway to Community Program. It's a sentence modification pilot program for incarcerated individuals who have reached the age of 50, and have served over 30 years. To be eligible for this program the petition must first be screened by DOC who shall determine whether the recommended petitioner for the program is eligible. This pilot program is for 15 men and 15 women. There's a restorative justice requirement, a notice to the victim and victim's family, a victim trauma funding, supervised release, as well as

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

independent researchers that shall assess the effectiveness of the program. And the Act will automatically sunset and be repealed after 6 years of the enactment. I'd ask for the support of the Body."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Bryant, for what reason do you rise?"

Bryant: "I rise in opposition to the Bill, please."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "Thank you. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

"Thank you. Representative, you and I've talked about this for a couple years. I think I remember that when we first talked about this or the first question that came up from the... I think is your constituent who first brought this up... it started out being those who were 70 years old. Just in conversation, I think by the time he brought it to you it was 60 years old. Last year it dropped down to 55 years old. This year it's at 50 years old. Primarily I believe because they weren't able to get enough individuals to make a pilot program work. But in some of the things that we've thought about this ... I'm just going to tell you some of my history so far with some of these... the individuals that will fall under the ability to go into this pilot program. So I don't know how many years ago it was now we did away with... with the death penalty. At that time we were doing away with the death penalty because we said we have Tamms Correctional Center. Six months to a year later we closed Tamms Correctional Center. Now we're looking at this Bill allowing murderers, murderers who are sentenced to life to be allowed to go into

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

a program where they'll be in the community. Even though it's a pilot program, we're going to allow them to go into the community. So I... I guess I'm... I'm wondering at what point do we... do we make murderers responsible for what they've done? I mean these... these are individuals that should never, never get back out again. And we're going to now let them be in our communities even though we're calling it a... a pilot program. So, Representative, I don't have any questions for you. I just... I believe in the conversations that we've had. I understand where your heart is. I think that this is misplaced and I... I would strongly urge, strongly urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Turner to close."

Turner: "Thank you for the debate. And I... I totally understand where you're coming from, Representative Bryant. I've worked on this Bill since about the 98th General Assembly. And we started with a much larger, much more encompassing Bill. And this has been whittled down to a pilot program for 30 individuals that have served at least 30 years in DOC. And who are the least likely to recommit or reoffend and end up back in the department. These are also some of your most expensive inmates. And so, this is just a pilot program. They'll still be under supervision throughout. As well as the other... the other pieces that we put in as far as notice and victim trauma. All of that. I think it's a good Bill at this point. I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2400 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Conroy, D'Amico, Hurley, Martwick. Mr. Clerk... Representative Turner. Take the record. I'm sorry. You want to take it out the record? Asking a question. Let me get clarification. You want to put this Bill on Postponed Consideration?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Jones, for what reason do you rise?"

Jones: "Thank God my mic is working. Hard act to follow. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Davis: "Please state your point."

Jones: "To my right is my Page for the day, Juan Yusef Galvan. He lives in Chatham. Juan is not only a coder, but Juan enjoys video games. He has two brothers. His parents are in the gallery. Where are your parents? Tell them to stand up. But his parents are in the gallery. Please join me in welcoming Juan to like the General Assembly. And also give him a round of applause."

Speaker Davis: "Glad to have to you here. Representative McDermed, for what reason do you rise?"

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like the record to reflect that for House Bill 1613 I intended to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Davis: "The record shall so reflect. House Bill 1915,

Representative Unes. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Read the Bill.

I'm sorry."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1915, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Unes."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Unes: "Thank you Mr. Chairman, Members of the Body. House Bill 1915 is language that will assist in an independent hemophilia centers and allow for more transparency. This also adds protections against corporate practice of medicine. I know of no opponents and I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1915 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Meier. Meyers-Martin. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2076. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2076, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Read the Bill for the third time."

  Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2076, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Villa on House Bill 2076."
- Villa: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2076 would ban paper receipts lined with BPA. BPA is a hormone disrupting chemical. Workers who handle these receipts are at risk, given how much they touch it each day. I have been working with all stakeholders, including Sierra Club, Food and Commercial Workers, IRMA, IMA, the bankers, the paper industry, and IEPA to alleviate any concerns with

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bill language. Everyone has been working in good faith. The stakeholders agreed that the final details will be worked out on the Amendment that will be heard once this is over in the Senate. They are all comfortable that we move forward and pass this as is on the House Floor today to allow time needed to finalize an agreement. When the Senate passes the amended Bill I will bring it back to committee for consideration of I want to thank Minority concurrence. Spokesperson Representative Welter, the Committee Chair Representative Williams, the business groups, Illinois EPA, labor and environmental groups for their input and interest in seeking an agreement. And I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Davis: "This Bill on Short Debate. Representative Welter, do you rise in favor or opposition?"

Welter: "Support."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Welter."

Welter: "To the Bill. I just want to... commend the Sponsor on this Bill or at least the process. With being a new Member and working through all this and deadline week. I know you had originally agreed to bring this back to committee on second. But after discussions with myself and all the opposition made it completely clear on your intentions in the Senate to work on this Bill. Although I... I don't necessarily agree with the underlying part of the Bill, I think once you bring it back from the Senate and it comes back on concurrence, which you've agreed to do, it could be a better Bill and have more support. But I would encourage those individuals that were in the committee room and had the impression that it was coming back,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

we've worked things out. We're going to let it go to the Senate. So I'd encourage an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, and the question is... I'm sorry, Representative Villa. Would you like to close?" Villa: "Yes. I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, and the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2076 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? DeLuca, Frese, McCombie, Murphy, Unes. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this vote, 76 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this, Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 250. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 250, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Walsh, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh on Floor Amendment #2."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  I move to adopt Floor Amendment #2. Basically what this does is excludes Cook County from joining up with other counties for a tax sale purposes on delinquent taxes. And it adds some language to make sure that they're contiguous. And the tax sale would take place at a mutually defined time, place, and date. I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Walsh moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Floor Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 250, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I pretty much explained the Bill on the Floor Amendment. The genesis behind this is a county treasurer's in smaller counties are looking to do cost savings as far as their delinquent tax sales. And possibly trying to save money instead of having them in multiple places. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, and the question is, 'Shall House Bill 250 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bourne, Brady, Halbrook, Hammond, Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3522, Representative Wehrli. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3522, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill." Speaker Davis: "Representative Wehrli."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Downstate Fire Pension Codes regarding fire chiefs. Amendment 2 is language brought to me by the fire chiefs. To make sure that in... in downstate communities we do have chiefs that actually work fires that this would allow them to be covered under disability. This would also make it that if a fire chief is

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

receiving a pension from a previous gig as a firefighter that they can only get a defined contribution pension plan. Similar to what we did for police chiefs. I'm here to answer any questions and I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Willis, for what reason do you rise? In support or opposition?"

Willis: "Opposition, please."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Willis: "Representative Wehrli, can you tell me... I'm looking and I see that the AFFI and the fire chiefs are still against this. Is that correct or did they pull it off with the amendment?"

Wehrli: "IFFI, with the Amendment, went neutral on it. The fire chiefs still have some concerns about it."

Willis: "What are their concerns?"

Wehrli: "Well I'm trying to figure that out. 'Cause the fire chief that I've been talking with, the president was on vacation. So we're going to move this over and continue to work it in the Senate. But we did remove the opposition of IFFI. It's my belief that their concern is that they just don't want to change the pension system. But this is... this is something that actually benefits them because if they're receiving their pension they will continue to do so. What this would do, in their second pension it would be a defined contribution. That is something that if they retire after two years, they're not vested in any other system. This would be an asset that they would keep with them. It's transferable to spouses, in inheritance to others, and things like that."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Willis: "Would this Bill, if this goes through... let's say I retire as a fire chief in one department, and start collecting my pension... through whatever... through downstate. Let's... let's go downstate instead of City of Chicago. 'Cause City of Chicago is a mess I don't want to go into."

Wehrli: "Thank you."

- Willis: "So we go to a Downstate Pension Fund and I begin to collect my pension. And then let's say six months down the line I get hired by another department. Will I have to stop collecting my pension at that point or will I be able to collect my pension and put into the confined... the defined contribution fund?"
- Wehrli: "You'll absolutely be allowed to keep your pension. And you'll be able to put into a defined contribution plan. So that you... actually will be getting a second pension. But the defined contribution plan you'll be able to negotiate with that local unit of government. If they want to give you a 50 percent match because you're an awesome fire chief they can do that. So this does in no way impair any previously earned pension. It's just on a go forward basis. How they can get a second defined contribution pension plan."
- Willis: "And we have your commitment that you're going to have this continue to work on through the Senate, and hopefully come back with something to concur with?"
- Wehrli: "Absolutely. The fire chiefs have been nothing but wonderful to work with. I... it's just, you know, we have a deadline tomorrow. You have my commitment to continue to work on this."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Willis: "All right. So my opposition is just a little bit there.

We'll see how it goes. Yes."

Wehrli: "It's only smoldering?"

Willis: "It's only smoldering. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wehrli to close."

Wehrli: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3522 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Morrison is excused for the rest of day." Speaker Davis: "The record will so reflect. House Bill 3661 Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3661, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3661 is an initiative of the Illinois Lottery. What this Bill does is it provides that the Lotto, the Lucky Day Lotto, Mega Millions, Power Ball, Pick Three, Pick Four, and other draw games that are offered at retail locations may be offered by the Department of the Lottery through its internet program. The Lottery Department projects that this change will grow revenue for

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

the Common School Fund five additional million dollars each year that this program is in effect. It is currently set... this Bill also extends the sunset to July 1, 2028. So it would draw an additional five million dollars a year through 2028. I would ask for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 3661."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, and the question is, 'Shall the House pass... House pass House Bill 3661?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Flowers, Jones, Mazzochi, Meier. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 101 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 71, Representative West. Out of the record. House Bill 3590, Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3590, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Yingling."

Yingling: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill just simply says that the Department... this is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Revenue. It says that they can withhold gambling income at the same rate as the Internal Revenue Service. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, and the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3590?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ford, Halbrook, Jones, Skillicorn. Mr. Clerk, take

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2676. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2676, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

  Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Zalewski on House Floor Amendment #2."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #2 simply a technical change that corrects a scrivener error. I ask for an adoption."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Zalewski moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2... House Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And House Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2676, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Chair... thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2676 is a... is a Bill that deals with public dental hygienist. We started a really good pilot program three years ago allowing public dental hygienist to... the ability to see the patient first. The rules were never adopted in JCAR. This

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

simply allows... makes the training statutory as opposed to rule-based. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill on Short Debate. What reason do you rise?"

Batinick: "Happy for Short Debate, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple quick clarifying questions if the Sponsor would yield?"

Speaker Davis: "The Sponsor will yield."

Batinick: "One, I wanted to make sure, we thought this was the electronic filing Bill. It clearly is not for our Members, correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Batinick: "All right. That's a yes. Head nod. And then there was some serious opposition to this originally. And now we're all good?"

Zalewski: "Yes. The dentists and the dental hygienists they work on people's teeth in close proximity. And down here they've manage to work together collaborative, Representative. This Bill is not anti-dentite. It is a good Bill."

Batinick: "I'm going to just let you close with that. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, and the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2676?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Yingling. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

passed. House Bill 124, Representative Arroyo. Out of the record. Representative Arroyo, for what reason do you rise?" Arroyo: "To call the Bill 124? Is that the Bill you said for me to call?"

Speaker Davis: "That was the Bill. Do you want to proceed?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Speaker Davis: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 124. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 124, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you. House Bill... House Bill 124 the intent of this Bill is to make any persons who have completed a 60 credit hours eligible to be able to apply to the State Police. Per... now you have to get a 4 year degree, so we're just trying to knock it down to a 60... 60 credit hours. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, and the question is... and the question is, 'Shall House Bill 124 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3393, Representative Buckner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3393, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Buckner."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Buckner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3393 is about live checks. Live checks are generally personal loans sent from banks or lenders to consumers, who meet certain criteria like a minimum credit score. Cashing the check enters the consumer into a loan agreement. This Bill amends the Consumer Fraud Deceptive Business Practices Act and provides that is unlawful to... it is an unlawful practice to send a consumer an unsolicited check that when cashed obligates the recipient to repay without disclosure. So this requires the lenders to put on the face of the check in 18 size font, 'This is a loan'. I urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "This Bill on Short Debate. Representative Davidsmeyer, do you rise in support or opposition?"
- Davidsmeyer: "In opposition-ish."
- Speaker Davis: "In opposition. I'm sorry. Representative Davidsmeyer, please proceed."
- Davidsmeyer: "I know there there were some concerns on this... this Bill. Did you happen to work with the opposition?"
- Buckner: "Yes, Representative, I did. I worked with the financial institutions who had issues with this. And the initial Bill before the Amendment would make all of these checks illegal across the state. What this does is just require a disclosure instead."
- Davidsmeyer: "So hopefully... hopefully this will take care of the concerns so you don't have to make them illegal. Hopefully this will just suffice, and people will realize that these are loans. They're not just free checks and free money, that they're something else."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Buckner: "Right. What we found when we looked at this around the country, is that a lot of states require that... that it says that these are loans. That was not a requirement here. And so, the crux of this was to make sure that people knew what they were signing up for before they did it."

Davidsmeyer: "All right. I think you've done a lot of good work, and I appreciate it. Thank you."

Buckner: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Buckner to close."

Buckner: "I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, and the question is 'Shall House Bill 3393 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1652, Representative Greenwood. Mr. Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1652, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Greenwood."

Greenwood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 1652 is an effort to ensure that active duty military members and their spouses have a clear and streamlined path toward becoming professionally licensed in Illinois. As we know, military personnel are often assigned to new duty stations with very little notice and their families uproot their entire lives to move to another state.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- So this Bill addresses those issues dealing with professional licensing. And I ask for 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, and the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1652?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Rita. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 840. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 840, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Floor Amendment #1 was adopted previously."
- Speaker Davis: "Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, take this Bill out of the record. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 81. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 81, a Bill for an Act concerning business. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved consideration. And No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 81, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Mr. Clerk, please take that Bill out of the record. Starting another list of priority Bills, we have House Bill 245, Representative Andrade. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 245, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Andrade."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 245 authorizes the use of mobile carrying devices on sidewalks. These devices kind of look like a version R2-D2 from Star Wars. They follow behind you and carry things like groceries or a bag. And also there is at this point no opposition, trial lawyers and the City of Chicago have removed opposition. And this also maintains Home Rule. So municipalities can regulate them themselves if they want to. If there's any questions, if not I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Guzzardi, for what reason do you rise?

Guzzardi: "Just a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Davis: "Sponsor will yield."

Guzzardi: "Representative Andrade, I... I thought I heard you say R2-D2 from Star Wars. Can... can you go into a little more detail about that?"

Andrade: "Yeah. So basically... I don't know if you remember a few months ago there was a little device here that basically followed behind you. So what it is, is it helps out the elderly, and it stays 10 feet with you. And it's like a little... think of it as a little red wagon. But instead of having to pull it, it actually takes a picture of your legs and it follows you 10 feet behind. And it looks like little R2-D2. But elderly use it to carry... right now you can... the goal is to have an older person just put their groceries in there and it just follows behind them so they don't have to carry it or pull it."

Guzzardi: "Do they communicate with beeps, or whistles, or other sort of noises?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Andrade: "I'm sure it does when it reverses."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Representative."

Andrade: "And it's going to have a hologram eventually."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion. Representative Andrade to close."

Andrade: "Respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 245 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Flowers, Keicher, Sommer, Ugaste. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2625, Representative Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2625, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Give me... give me a minute, Mr. Speaker. I'll be right with you. Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 2625 requires that the General Assembly redraw the Cook County subcircuits after 2020 federal decennial census that reflects the population of change in Cook County over a 30 year cycle. This subcircuits haven't been redistricted over 30 years. And I would just like to make sure when we have redrawing of the census they'll be able to add the subcircuits to it. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, and the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2625?' All those in favor vote

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Buckner, Butler, Frese, Greenwood, Mayfield, Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 98 Members voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1579. Please read that Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1579, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Burke on House Floor Amendment #1."
- Burke: "The Amendment changes a 'shall' to a 'may' and removes opposition from the public defenders."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Burke moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1579, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1579 updates the Disorderly Conduct Statute to reflect that threats to the safety of school students, or personnel, or buildings are

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

often made via social media or text. The Bill also provides clarification for judges that for a minor who has been charged with disorderly conduct in regard to a threat to a school the judge may require a mental health evaluation before any sentence is imposed. I do have an Amendment pending... I have an Amendment that will be put on the Senate version of this that addresses a concern of the ACLU and it will come back here on concurrence. I know of no additional opposition. It has support from the Cook County State's Attorney as well as the public defender and the Illinois Association of State's Attorney. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, and the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1579?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed... all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Didech. Harper. Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 907, Representative Connor. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 907, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Connor, has been approved consideration."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Connor."

Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. HB907 has the Department of Human Services place resources on its website involving school shooting and bullying for school social workers, teachers,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

and parents. I know of no opposition. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 907?' All those in favor vote 'yes'... I am so sorry. I'm sorry, Representative, we have to adopt the Amendment. You move that the floor... that the House adopt Floor Amendment #2? All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And House adopts Floor Amendment #2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 907, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Connor."

Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've already described the Bill.

I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 907?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to table... Representative Mah, for what reason do you rise?"

Mah: "I'd like to note for the Journal that I intended to vote 'yes' on HB2625."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Speaker Davis: "The record will so reflect. Representative Willis in the Chair."
- Speaker Willis: "Willis in the Chair. On page 22, House Bill 3586, Leader Crespo. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3586, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Willis: "Leader Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3586 is another Bill in response to the ISBE's investigation to the Special Education practices at CPS. It would have schools to provide all draft documents to parents at least 5 school days before an IEP meeting is scheduled. It also has schools notify the parents when the district fails to implement a child's IEP within 10 school days. And would require CPS to provide public notice on proposed changes to the District Special Education Policies and Procedures with sufficient time for public comment. Happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Willis: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3586 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Butler, Davis, Ramirez, Sommer. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the roll. On this question, there are 115 voting in 'favor', 0 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. Having... this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 19, House Bill 1876, Representative Wilhour. Clerk, please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1876, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Wilhour."

Wilhour: "Thank you, Madam Chair. This is a small change to an existing statute that currently says that only a fire chief in a local fire department can have red emergency lights on their vehicles. This Amendment would add Deputy and Assistant Fire Chief to that list. These folks would still be required to meet all of the training that's outlined in the existing statute. And then I'd appreciate your support. I'm open for questions."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Welter, for what do you seek recognition?"

Welter: "Does... does Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Welter: "Representative Wilhour, is this your first Bill?"

Wilhour: "It is."

Welter: "Are you nervous?"

Wilhour: "I'm terrified."

Welter: "Very good. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Seeing no further... oh I'm sorry, Representative... seeing no further discussion the question... Representative Wilhour, would you like to close?"

Wilhour: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1876 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On
this question, there are 113 voting in 'favor', 0 voting

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

'against', O voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports, please."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3152. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill House Bill 102. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 122. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2856. Representative Scherer, Chairperson from the Committee Elementary & Secondary Education: Administration, Licensing & Charter School reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 423; Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 2100. Representative Evans, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1918, Floor Amendment #2 to House 3390. Representative Jones, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2173. Representative Slaughter, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Criminal reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House 1115, Floor Amendment #3 to House Representative Costello, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2576. Representative Conroy, Chairperson from the Committee on Mental Health reports the following committee action taken on April 11, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2247. Representative Welch, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2468, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3358. Representative Cassidy, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1874, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2028. Representative Williams, Chairperson from the Committee on Energy & Environment reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 840, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2491, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3068. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary - Civil reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Hurley, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3196. Representative Martwick, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on April 11, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2909. Representative Kifowit, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2670, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2786, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2924, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3084, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3711. Representative Guzzardi, Chairperson from the Committee on Prescription Affordability & Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 465. Representative Andrade, Chairperson from the Committee on Cybersecurity, Data Analytics, & IT reports the following committee action taken on April 11, 2019: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3606. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 284, offered by Representative Lilly; House Resolution 287, offered by Representative Miller; and House Resolution 289, offered by Representative McSweeney are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Willis: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Representative Davis, for what do you seek recognition?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Davis: "Let the record reflect that Representative La Shawn Ford is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Willis: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Kalish, for which do you seek recognition?"
- Kalish: "I just want to reflect my vote properly. HB2425 has me
  as 'present', it should be 'no'."
- Speaker Willis: "The record shall reflect. Thank you.

  Representative Unes, for what do you seek recognition?"

Unes: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Willis: "Please proceed."

- Unes: "Madam Speaker and Members of the Body, I'd like to recognize a special guest we have with us in the gallery.

  Behind us on the Republican side is the Fulton County

  Treasurer Staci Mayall is with us visiting the Capitol. If we could please give her a Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Willis: "Welcome to the Capitol. House Bill 2315,
  Representative Evans. Representative Evans on House Bill
  2315. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2315, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Evans, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Willis: "Representative Evans on the Amendment, please."
- Evans: "Thank you, Mrs. Speaker. This initiative of the Secretary of State, is an Omnibus Bill. Some cleanup language with regarding to the REAL ID. I request support in moving this Amendment. Adopt the Amendment."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "Representative Evans moves adoption of Floor Amendment 2. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Willis: "Third Reading. Representative Evans on the Bill."

Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2315, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Yeah. Again, the Amendment is the Bill. It's an omnibus piece of legislation clarifying the REAL ID. It was needed. There's no opposition. I request your support."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick is recognized."

Batinick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, it looks like there was a little bit of opposition to it in committee. Can you speak to that?"

Evans: "I'm not sure. I think the opposition wasn't made clear. I think it's regard to individuals, asylum seekers and refugees. So that generally causes some pause but it really was clarification language for the REAL ID. Those individuals are already eligible to receive a license. But when you throw certain things out people become cautious. So I think that created some of the opposition. But I... I wasn't really clear on what the opposition was. I think it was more concern."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Batinick: "Okay. So REAL IDs may only be issued to applicants who are lawfully present in the U.S. and can present documentation of that fact?"

Evans: "Yeah. And the Amendment just added clarifying language to existing law. If you don't like the existing law, I understand. That's... that's something we can take up later. But this is just about clarifying the existing law with the Amendment."

Batinick: "You're codifying Federal Law? Thank you for your answers."

Evans: "No, thank you."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Evans to close."

Evans: "Thank you for your support."

Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2315 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting in 'favor', 14 voting 'against', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Guzzardi on House Bill 254. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 254, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Willis: "Third Reading. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 254, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Willis: "Representative Guzzardi on the Bill."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Members. This Bill simply instructs local school districts to report to the public and to the State Board of Education data about class sizes. We know the importance of class size for improving educational outcomes. So we're simply trying to collect some data to make sure that we're in line with our goals and the evidence-based funding formula. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Batinick, you are recognized."

Batinick: "The Republicans request... no, I'm kidding. I think we're going to put this on Standard Debate, if that's okay?"

Speaker Willis: "Granted."

Batinick: "Thank you... thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative,

I'm just seeing a whole list of opponents here. What's the
nature of their opposition?"

Guzzardi: "You know the only opponents who've contacted me about the Bill are the School Management Alliance. And I think in principle they... any time we tell them that we want data about anything they just file an opposition in principle. This Bill, as you may recall, passed in a similar form during the last General Assembly. But when we called it up for a Veto Override I got some very thoughtful questions from your side of the aisle. Which to my discredit I didn't have any good answers to."

Batinick: "That happens a lot doesn't it?"

Guzzardi: "Yeah. It does happen a lot. And this time I actually listened to them."

Batinick: "I appreciate that. Did you do any regionalization in this Bill? Is there regionalization in this Bill?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Guzzardi: "I believe that it was Representative Demmer who was asking why the goals that we had set out in the previous version of the Bill were different from the goals in the evidence-based funding formula. And that was a very good question and to my discredit didn't have a very good answer. So we amended the Bill this year. So now these goals are exactly aligned with evidence-based funding goals. So we're not just setting a different standard than the evidence-based funding formula."
- Batinick: "So to be clear, requires each school district to report the information required for the State Board's report no later than November 2... so you're just requiring the school boards to report class size. Am I missing anything else?"
- Guzzardi: "No, that's it. They report it to... they put it on their website and they submit it to the state. And the state has a couple months to collect the data and make it public for everybody else."
- Batinick: "And then after the Amendment you've got... you removed some of the opposition with the Amendment?"
- Guzzardi: "That's right, yeah. The Amendment was at the request of the State Board of Education. We believe that satisfied a number of the opponents."
- Batinick: "Okay. It's been a while since I've said this but I think I'm going to sit back and listen to the rest of debate.

  Thank you."

Guzzardi: "I love watching you sit back, Representative."

Speaker Willis: "Representative Bourne, you're recognized."

Bourne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Willis: "He indicates he will."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Bourne: "Thank you. Actually my computer just turned off, so I guess I'm going to wing this. Could you explain just very briefly how this is different from the last... I know you said it's different from last time. It requires reporting. Does it require reporting and then is there anything on the back end?"
- Guzzardi: "So, yeah, last time we had set out goals in statute for where class sizes ought to wind up. And I was asked the very valid question of why those goals were different from the targets that were built into the evidence-based funding? The goals were based on research. It's a fair question but we decided in order to make this Bill more palatable to some of those folks who had objections that we would just align the goals in the Bill to the goals in the evidence-based funding formula. So we think it's a much more streamlined process."
- Bourne: "And you said you don't know the specific concerns of any of the opponents that are listed?"
- Guzzardi: "Yeah, the only concern I've had is that it... you know, it fits in the general concern of this requires us to collect data. But I've spoken with a number of principals and superintendents who say this data is available at the click of a button and it's not going to require any sort of extra hassle."
- Bourne: "So... so they're saying that this information is already available?"
- Guzzardi: "At the school level it is. Right? So every school could very easily find out how many students are in each class at each grade level."

Bourne: "Right."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Guzzardi: "But what we're looking is to aggregate that data statewide so we can start making comparisons about how different districts are addressing class size challenges."
- Bourne: "So I've... I've gotten a few other concerns from organizations and I'd love for you to clarify maybe if they're addressed in your Bill."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Bourne: "So number one, how are parents going to use this information, right? We know that schools are underfunded. We know that sometimes they're forced to have higher class sizes than they would like to have. Whether it be because they can't find teachers to fill the positions or they can't afford to hire that position."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

- Bourne: "What are the... what are the ramifications if the school reports this and when it's not in alignment with your stated goals is there anything that happens afterwards?"
- Guzzardi: "Let me make sure I'm understanding your question.

  You're saying if a school reports their class sizes, and those class sizes are higher than we'd like them to be, what then happens? Is that your question?"
- Bourne: "Right. But it's not totally painting the full picture, right? They're not able to say we aren't able to achieve this class size because of X. They're just reporting a number."
- Guzzardi: "Sure. Yeah, so just to be clear, there's no sort of punitive measures attached to this Bill. So it's not to say that if you're school or your school district has classes over a certain size we're going to punish you in any way. In fact, the intent is just the opposite. We want to identify

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

those schools and districts that are having challenges with class sizes to make sure we can provide them the supports and resources they need."

Bourne: "And I've also heard that this could be a safety concern to break it down to the classroom level, right? So we're able to tell people in this classroom if you are looking for targets of students this classroom with 30 students is a riper target than this classroom with 18. What's your... I mean we can already look at the... the grade level numbers. Breaking it down by classroom there are concerns that that could be problematic."

Guzzardi: "So we actually address that concern in the Amendment actually. This was brought to me as well."

Bourne: "Okay."

Guzzardi: "So I heard this concern from some superintendents. I think it's sort of a grim concern and one that, knock on wood, we never have to worry about. But I understand where it's coming from. And so, we decided that we didn't want to break it down by individual class, right? We didn't want to say, you know, Mrs. Jones class in eighth grade has this many students and Mrs. Smith's class in ninth grade has this many students. But we're breaking it across grade level and subject area rather than by individual classroom."

Bourne: "So if it's broken down by grade level then how do we know what the class size is in the classroom?"

Guzzardi: "So let's say that, you know, in school X the seventh grade classes have an average class size of whatever the number is, right? So it wouldn't tell us each individual class room size. Again, this is... I think that the information that

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

would be available here is really simply trying to give us a more granular picture of stuff we already know, right? So we have district level data about this on report cards.

Bourne: "Right."

Guzzardi: "We want to get a more granular look at... for instance in the school district where I represent it's a very large district and there are lots of disparities within the district. I know that's true of many other districts as well. So we want to be able to just to look a little more granularly than we're able to see right now."

Bourne: "So could you give me a little bit of background? How is this going to help? Who's going to be making decisions based on this data and how will this help them?"

Guzzardi: "Well, I think a lot of folks could. I think that school district leadership could make decisions based on this data."

Bourne: "They already have this information. Clearly."

Guzzardi: "Right. They have it at the highest level. And they could certainly get it at a more granular level because they're administrators and they have access to it. But we think that, for instance, we might be able to put together reports and research and modeling based on this data that could be really useful to administrators who are looking at it from the 30 thousand foot level. Again, in a huge district like the one I represent maybe they're seeing it from a very high level but the granularity might be able to help them address and direct resources in a more equitable way. And then I think it also might be helpful for us to be able to look at the state and say communities like this, you know, small, rural communities tend to have challenges with class

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

sizes at the K-4 level, or whatever information we might find. And then to target supports and resources to those communities."

Bourne: "And I think one last question. When we're looking at this information I know that the previous version of the Bill broke it down differently. And the goals that we have in the education funding formula are broken down based on students in poverty and students who are not in poverty. Do you have those broken down in your Amendment?"

Guzzardi: "Well, so we'll be able to... that information is already available at the school level, right? So we'll be able to cross-reference the data we're going to collect with this. With that kind of... it's a really good point actually. Like we'll be able to see, based on the information we have about, you know, the number of students who are in free and reduced lunch programs for instance. We'll say okay, boy, schools with really high levels of poverty are also challenging with... struggling with class sizes. Or, you know, we might find that schools that have high levels of poverty but low class sizes are out performing their peers that have high class sizes, right? This is all the kinds of data that we're going to find with this Bill."

Bourne: "And could you give me a little bit of background on what it's going to take to comply with this? I know that you say that school districts already have this information. Clearly they do because it's students in their school district. But we're adding one more thing for them to report and then for someone to compile. Can you walk me through that?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Guzzardi: "Yeah. I think that the... the State Board of Education is going to do some compiling of this. The school districts are going to publish it on their websites. This is information that's available to districts and to principals at the click of a button. So I really don't think that it's going to be a terribly burdensome or onerous reporting requirement. And then the State Board of Education will simply compile that data and put it together. And I think that independent researchers will have a lot of fun digging into it. But that won't be a require... we're not requiring the State Board to produce a report or to do any sort of analysis. They just have to publish the data."

"Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. I think, you know, the Bourne: Sponsor has good intentions. I'm a little bit concerned about the compliance that school districts will have to... to go through. I think that most of this information is probably already available for all of your school districts if you're interested. I think if you are interested in digging into the class level data... I know that's information we looked at in the school funding reform discussions that we had. I think adding one more mandate to school districts is difficult, especially in this environment. I would urge a 'no' vote. Information is always good but when we keep asking them for more and more and more without the contextual clues around it of what that class size means in that district, why they've gotten to that number, why it's best for their students is a little challenging to ask of them. So I understand your intention, Will, and I think that... I thank you for your work

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

on this Bill from last year. But I would still urge a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Willis: "Seeing no further discussion, the Chair recognizes Representative Guzzardi to close."
- Guzzardi: "Thank you, colleagues. And I appreciate the questions. I think that this Bill is maybe simpler than it's being described. This is data that is very readily accessible to school districts and to school principals and administrators. All we're trying to do is to package that data, to bundle it all together and then to share it with the general public. So that everybody around the state can compare district to district, school to school. This is a very simple transparency measure. I don't think it will be any sort of burden at all on the local districts to comply with, nor with the state. And I think this data will very... will be very helpful to us in making sure that our school kids get better outcomes. So I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Willis: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 254 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting in 'favor', 30 voting 'opposed', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Davis in the Chair."
- Speaker Davis: "The Clerk is in receipt of a Motion in Writing to Table House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 840. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is tabled. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 840. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 840, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

Floor Amendment #1 was just tabled. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mason, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mason on House Floor Amendment #2."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 840 relates to Mason: decommissioning nuclear power plants in the State Illinois. My district has one. There are others throughout Illinois. The nuclear decommissioning process is a lengthy process. And we want to be absolutely sure that the General Assembly continues to monitor the progress and makes sure that sufficient funding is set aside to appropriately continue the decommissioning process in each of these plants. So this is a simple Bill that takes information that owners, operators of nuclear power plants that are going through the decommissioning process already have, has them submit the reports to the Illinois Commerce Commission. And then requests that the Illinois Commerce Commission submits them every two years to the General Assembly for review. So every two years we'd get these reports, ensure that funding is sufficient to make sure that our communities are safe. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Butler on the Amendment."

Butler: "We can wait 'til Third that's fine. Thank you, Sir. I didn't realize it was an Amendment."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mason asks for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 840, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mason."

Mason: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I explained the Bill just a moment ago. It's a simple requirement that doesn't add additional work other than the passing on of the information to the Illinois General Assembly. It's essential information for us to continue to be on top of. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Butler, this Bill is on Short Debate. Do you rise in opposition?"

Butler: "I do."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Butler: "Question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she'll yield."

Butler: "Thank you. And, Representative, I just want to reprise what we've talked about in committee a little bit. These are currently federal reports that are done, that are given to NRC that are current publicly available reports, correct?"

Mason: "Yes. So as we discussed in committee they are publicly available through the Federal Commission. However, every two years we are asking that they go through a process to submit

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

them to the General Assembly so that we can make the information the priority it needs to be."

Butler: "Okay. To the... to the Bill.

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Butler: "And I understand that the reasoning for this. This is a very important issue for your district and I certainly sympathize with that. But this... this is taking a federal report, giving it to the ICC and then the ICC giving it to the General Assembly. It's... we're just passing a report around that is publicly available that we can already look at as Members of the General Assembly. We're just adding to state statute with statutes we don't need to add to for a report that's currently publicly available that we can all take a look at. So I understand why you're wanting to do this. It's an important issue for you but I... I just cannot support it."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Williams, we've already had one in favor. This Bill is on Short Debate. Representative Mason to close."

Mason: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So to the comments, this is publicly available information. However, not to throw any of my colleagues under the bus, but during these discussions in committee, a few people pointed out that they don't read reports that are given to them already. And I would venture to say that to ask people to think about this important information and go out and actually seek the information is making a really big ask. And the one thing that I believe Representative Williams brought up, is that one thing is for sure we don't read the reports that don't come to us. So this is not only important for my district, this is important for

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

the State of Illinois. Because should something fall through the cracks at a decommissioning nuclear power plant, should they run out of the funding that they have committed to provide, there are safety issues. There are economic development issues. And it... so it's important for all of us. So to ask that this report simply be placed in front of the General Assembly, to say hey this is a priority and we need you to be aware of it, I don't think is asking too much to protect our families and our economy here in Illinois. So it... it's a simple move. It's unfortunate that you know processes have to be a little complicated in government, but that's... that's how it goes. And it's important information for all of us to have in front of us. So I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 840 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chesney, Moeller, Wehrli, Willis, Yingling. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 73 Members voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2591, Representative Cabello. Mr. Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2591, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2591 reinstates that the intent of the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

underlying Bill... excuse me, this were... Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. What we're trying to do here, Ladies and Gentlemen, is this is an initiative of the Rockford Police Department. They hired two females to become officers. During their training they have to go through a physical agility test. The Rockford Police Department uses free weights... and excuse me, a weight machine. When they got to the State Academy they used free weights. And the two females, unfortunately, failed. Which states now that the Rockford Police Department could never hire them again. This Bill says that within a year after the Rockford Police Department or any other department could hire them back to try make sure that they go forward. It also gives the ILSP the authority and duty to disqualify officers for entering a plea of guilty for a felony offense. Current law covers only convictions. It also gives ILSP investigators the ability investigate like other statewide investigators. Happily ask for any questions. And respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass 25... House Bill 2591?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Didech. Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1587, Representative Harper. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1587, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Representative Harper."

Harper: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to present House Bill 1587. This Bill simply allows judges to give what we are calling smart sentences to individuals who are convicted of a crime but do not pose a threat to public safety. So it just allows judges to sentence an offender to a sentence less than the statutory minimum when it makes sense. We have been working on this Bill to remove opposition. There are a couple of changes that we need to make in the Senate that we look forward to making. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Bryant, for what reason do you rise?"

Bryant: "In opposition, but I'd also like to ask for Standard Debate, please."

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate."

Bryant: "Thank you. Representative, I know you've worked on this Bill but there is still a lot of offenses that are not covered. I think even with the Amendment, looking at some of the offenses that are still not covered. So we're still talking about solicitation, solicitation of murder, solicitation of murder for hire, drug-induced homicides, concealment of homicide death, concealment of death, unlawful restraint, aggravated unlawful restraint, forcible detention, child abduction, luring of a minor, burglary, possession of burglary tools, unlawful sale of burglary, residential burglary, home invasion, and I think... I don't think that that's an all-inclusive list. So although I understand what you're trying to do, we have sentencing for certain offenses for very good reason. Because there are... there still a whole

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

plethora of charges that are… allowing the reduction… the possibility of reduction of sentencing, I will be a 'no' vote today. And I urge our side to be a 'no' vote as well."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, for what reason do you rise?"

Batinick: "I... I rise in opposition to the Bill. And would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, this Bill did not come through my committee but I had been following it. And I just want to make sure basically what we're doing is, is we have mandatory minimums and now they are optional. Is that right?"

Harper: "No, I believe there's a misunderstanding about the Bill. First of all, we did do an Amendment that was adopted. And this Bill only refers to offenses only involving drug use or possession, retail theft, or driving on a revoked license for unpaid financial obligation. The actual language says just that. So I just want to clarify that for you."

Batinick: "Okay. This is... we've got Floor Amendment 4 here. So that... and we've had several Amendments on the Bill. And that's why I'm clarifying it 'cause I know it's been a long day and we're all tired. We want to make sure everybody's doing what they want to do on this Bill. So with Amendment 4 can you tell me... let's be... if it's an optional mandatory minimum it's no longer a mandatory minimum, right? So why don't you for legislative..."

Harper: "For those three types...

Batinick: "Right. Right."

Harper: "Yeah... just for those three."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Batinick: "Okay. And I was scrolling through here trying to get to find that information in my analysis. Can you give me the three types of... of offenses where we're removing the mandatory minimum?"
- Batinick: "Okay can you give me three..."
- Harper: "And those offenses are, an offense involving drug possession, retail theft, or driving on a revoked license. The same three that I just mentioned before."
- Batinick: "Can we get into the drug offenses specifically? Does that include... what... just possession, not dealing, just possession?"
- Harper: "It's possession and use, and the language that we're using was approved by and came from the State's Attorney."
- Batinick: "Which State's Attorney?"
- Harper: "Cook County... the Cook County State's Attorney. But in doing that it removed the opposition from the Illinois State's Attorney."
- Batinick: "Okay. So what is the current... who's currently opposed to it? I see with Floor Amendment 4 Chicago FOP still opposes, and we have here State's Attorneys have no position with the adoption of this Amendment. Is that correct in your analysis?"
- Harper: "I don't currently... yes, that is correct."
- Batinick: "That is correct? Hold on. What is the threshold on the retail theft?"
- Harper: "Three hundred."
- Batinick: "Okay. Honestly, Representative, sometimes I wish we could have staff get on the microphone. That is just for...

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

hang on a second... for felonies only, correct? So the mandatory minimum for felonies only now there's some discretion."

Harper: "Can you repeat the question?"

Batinick: "So that's for felonies only. So if there's a mandatory minimum sometimes for retail theft and that's where there is now the judge has some deviation ability as you would call it?"

Harper: "Yes."

Batinick: "Okay. And is there any... on the drug possession is there any mandatory minimum left regardless of how much? Like the weight of it. So if I have if possession is one gram, a one thousand grams is there any... is there any deviation with Amendment 4 that says there's still a mandatory minimum at a certain amount?"

Harper: "That is up to the judge but the State's Attorneys, as I stated before, that's one of the things that we are cleaning up in the Senate."

Batinick: "Okay. And I'm sorry it's much nicer to look at you than it is to look at the screen. I actually think this has been a pretty good conversation. I'm not sure that you're going to get a whole lot of support from this side. But I think we're definitely drilling down into specifically, exactly what... what the Bill does. So you're down to three offenses. You're down to drugs, retail theft, revoked license. We're going to say that if the judge has discretion then it's no longer a mandatory minimum. I think that that's semantical. So I'm going to go head and give you that, that there's some ability for deviation there. But the judge has his discretion essentially removing that. But it's for those

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

three things. And you believe in the Senate they'll fix something with the size of the amount of drugs that they have with the mandatory minimum, correct?"

Harper: "We're already working on that right now as we speak."

Batinick: "Okay. And for clarity I think some of us on our side with all the Amendments and the blurry eyed of our day we didn't realize where the fourth Amendment was and where this Bill has finally landed. I appreciate you indulging us. Thank you very much."

Harper: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Connor, for what reason do you rise?"

Connor: "To... to speak on the Bill in support."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Connor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the Sponsor for this Bill.

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Connor: "As a former prosecutor, and I know there are a number of other former prosecutors in this House, there are situations you come across in which you convict someone of a crime, and at the sentencing neither you nor the judge believe that they should get what has been set as the statutory minimum. However, under the circumstances if the law says that's the mandatory minimum that's what they get. So I appreciate the Sponsor for limiting this to those three categories that will be the most effective. And for setting a precedent that when judges, and prosecutors at times, see that the mandatory minimum is not appropriate in a case, they now have the ability to try to impose something other than that mandatory

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

minimum and get the person back to functioning in society as quickly as possible. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Skillicorn, for what reason do you rise?"

Skillicorn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Skillicorn: "So last year I was at a conference and former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich was asked what his biggest mistake ever was. So let's give you a little background. Newt Gingrich, Republican Speaker of the House. He was the guy who was the originator of the contract for America, won the U.S. Congress from Democrat control for decades and decades, very conservative individual. His answer to that question what his biggest mistake ever was... was he... when he teamed up with President Bill Clinton for the Crime Bill which expanded mandatory minimums. He explained to the crowd how much damage mandatory minimums have done to many, many communities. He explained to the crowd how mandatory minimums actually hurt people and hurt those communities. Literally this is one of the conservative architects of the 1990s and he admitted that mandatory minimums were a mistake. A big mistake. His greatest mistake. I'm a conservative Republican and I'm going to support this Bill today. And I ask everyone here to vote 'aye'. Thanks."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Harper to close."

Harper: "I just wanted to make a clarification that the revoked license would be for financial obligations. And I encourage an 'aye' vote."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1587 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cabello, Conroy, D'Amico, DeLuca, Hurley, Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 61 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 386, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 386, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 386 requires the Illinois Department of Corrections and the Illinois Prisoner Review Board to produce an annual public report that details how they are using electronic monitoring as it relates to mandatory supervised release. The various committee hearings that we've had on this subject matter in Judicial-Crim exposed a myriad of concerns on both sides of the aisle regarding this topic. We're... we're hoping that this Bill will be able to address some of those concerns by studying this initiative. The Department of Corrections, we're working with them. They... they may show up as opposing your Bill. But I respectfully ask can we get this over to the Senate and they would be okay with a technical Amendment that would address their... their concerns. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill... seeing no discussion... seeing no discussion, 'Shall the House Bill...

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

shall the House pass House Bill 386?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Grant. Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 938, Representative Walsh. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 938, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Walsh, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh on House Floor Amendment #1."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment 1 is a gut and replace that would extend the sunset on non-Home Rule sales tax from December of 2020 to July 1 of 2030 and give those non-Home Rule municipalities the ability to use proceeds for operational expense. And I'd ask for an 'aye'... or move for its adoption."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House adopts House Floor Amendment #1. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 938, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just explained the Bill on the Floor Amendment during Second Reading. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill is on Short Debate. Do you rise in support or opposition?"

Batinick: "I'm rising in opposition-ish. And it will be a short... short debate."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, are you expanding taxing authority in any way, shape, or form in this Bill?"

Walsh: "No, it's... the current tax right now there's no expansion of it. Right now... so this is brought by the City of Crest Hill. They had... non-Home Rule capacity to have the sales tax used for operational. Usually it's used for just capital or infrastructure uses. They had a... we passed a Bill, I don't know, 10 years ago or so that gave them the availability to use that portions of that sales tax for operational expenses. And all this would do is extend that sunset. They're not looking to change anything."

Batinick: "Do you have any idea when... when was the original Bill passed and why there was the sunset put in?"

Walsh: "It was under PA96, so it came out in the 96th General Assembly."

Batinick: "About 10 years ago?"

Walsh: "So well about five years ago then, or whenever it was."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Batinick: "Five General Assemblies ago. I think our terms are two years."
- Walsh: "Yep. So either which way. They set a sunset on it. And they're just looking to continue that 'cause if it goes away they're not able to use those proceeds for operational expenses."
- Batinick: "So could one make an argument that if this goes away you would have to raise property taxes to make up for the funds of... I'm a kind of helping you out here... if they don't have this ability they have to get the money from somewhere else like property taxes? Allowing them more flexibility in how they use their sales tax dollars, then allows them the ability to keep other taxes lower. Am I reading into this correctly?"
- Walsh: "That... that would be a correct statement. I believe that the initiative of this is to not put it on property owners, you'd have the sales tax there that you're able to use the proceeds for."

Batinick: "Okay. I thank you for your clarifications."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Skillicorn, for what reason do you rise?"

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Representative yield?"

Speaker Davis: "Are you rising in support or opposition?"

Skillicorn: "Opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Would you like to move this to Standard Debate?"

Skillicorn: "Opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Would you like to move this to..."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Skillicorn: "Yes, I'd like to move that we go to Standard Debate.

Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate."

Skillicorn: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Sir. Very... very quick here. The description of a municipal operations, does that include pay raises and pension hikes?"

Walsh: "Well it very well could. I think the issue of this is that right now the City of Crest Hill and these non-Home Rule communities that have this access that use a portion of the sales tax to operate... to fund operational expenses. Basically if this goes away then those... the sales tax doesn't go away but it's limiting the use for it's... the way it can be funded or be used. And if it's tied to just capital, then you're going to have come up with those operational expenses or services would have to be cut."

Skillicorn: "Thank you for answering my question. To the Bill." Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Skillicorn: "You know this extending another tax hike on the people of Illinois. According to WalletHub, the people of Illinois are the most taxed in the nation. I've got to urge a 'no' vote. This is just an extension of yet another tax hike. And, you know, expect about a water tax hike, a gas tax hike, a bag tax hike, and an unlimited graduated tax hike. That's a lot of tax hikes for the people of Illinois to bare. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh to close."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Walsh: "So thank you. Just for clarification, there's no tax hike in here. This is a sales tax that cannot be raised without referendum approval. So it's the current rates. It's just on how those dollars are used within a municipality. So there's no tax hike in this Bill. It's just an extension of what's been going on for the last 10 years with non-Home Rule communities that get referendum approval for the way these things are used. So with that, I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 938 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bryant, Caulkins, Davidsmeyer, Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 98 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2100, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2100, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2, 3, and 4 have been approved consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Welch on House Floor Amendment #2."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #2 and move for adoption of Floor Amendment 3 and 4."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Speaker Davis: "House Floor Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk,
  House Floor Amendment #3."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Davis: "Floor Amendment #3, Representative Welch."
- Welch: "I'd like to move for adoption of Floor Amendment #3 and then move for adoption of #4 and debate the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Davis: "Would you like to speak to the Floor Amendment?"
- Welch: "Floor Amendment #3 was drafted after negotiation with INCS, Noble Charter Schools, the School Management Alliance, ISBE, IEA and this is result of those negotiations."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Welch moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Welch."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Welch on House Floor Amendment #4."
- Welch: "Floor Amendment #3 contains language that..."
- Speaker Davis: "#4."
- Welch: "Floor Amendment #4, I apologize Mr. Speaker... contains language that was inadvertently left out of Amendment #3. And taken together, they become the Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Welch moves for... Representative Sosnowski, do you wish to... Representative Welch moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #4. All those in favor say

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the House adopts House Floor Amendment #4. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2100, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Welch."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2100 is a Bill that I've been working on for several years. And I believe that we are there. House Bill 2100 abolishes the Charter School Commission and it would go out of existence in July of 2020. All of its authority would be transferred to the Illinois State Board of Education. The result of our negotiations, I believe, has resulted in a win-win for everyone. We currently have 9 charters in existence, 10 campuses. There will be an appeal process at ISBE for those existing charters. Anything that has been granted by the Charter School Commission, when it comes up for renewal, they would go before ISBE. If for instance CPS is authorized a charter and they decide not to renew or revoke a charter there would be a right of appeal to ISBE. However, if a locally elected school board outside of Chicago, in the suburbs and downstate were to deny an application that comes before a locally elected school board that application would go to a court for judicial review. So there was a compromise. And in the room was INCS, Noble Charter Schools, the School Management Alliance, IEA and no one is completely happy. And that's when I know we've had a good negotiation. No one is completely happy but we've got a

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

good compromise up on the board. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2100."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Sosnowski, for what reason do you rise?"

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Do you rise in opposition?"

Sosnowski: "I'd ask that this be on Standard Debate, please?"

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate. For what reason do you rise?"

Sosnowski: "I rise in opposition to this Bill. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Sosnowski: "You touched on it in your last comment as far as a school board, CPS, or any other school board that would consider a new charter applicant. And if that was denied there'd be a process for that, could you just explain that in a little bit more detail? Just as far as on what basis would an applicant be able to then appeal that decision?"

Welch: "If it was a new charter application and a new charter application was denied, it would go to court for judicial review."

Sosnowski: "And when you say judicial review would there be any criteria on which an applicant could base their appeal to the courts?"

Welch: "They would be able to... the court would be able to look and see if the school district has followed its published procedures for a charter school application."

Sosnowski: "To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Sosnowski: "Just want to make everybody aware of this... and I think when we say not many people are happy, I think that's very true... this essentially ends any possible appeal process in the sense that if a local school district just says no the applicants can only really then go to court. And say, well court were there technical issues with the applications or the hearings, and those types of things. No court is going to take up any true appeal based on the merits of an actual charter school. So if a community would like to have a charter school, it's got widespread support, lots of supporters, families, children. They ask their school board, the school board just says no. Really there's no future outlet. They cannot appeal it to the state board. They cannot appeal it to the Charter Commission which would be abolished. And this is really a disservice to charter schools that are not necessarily operating now. As you mentioned, if they've been given charter by the State Charter Commission they'll continue to operate under ISBE. But there'll be no more opportunities to appeal. And when we talk about the appeal process there's only been a handful of schools in which ISBE has overturned the local jurisdiction. And then they take on overseeing the management of that particular charter. I also have a concern when we look at charters that are currently existence. Many of us may have charters in our communities. Now, if a local school board now determines that they're not going to renew that charter, there's no opportunity for that charter school to appeal that decision. So I repeat, again, if you have a charter school in your area, you're happy with it, if the local school district decides not to renew their

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

applicant that charter school now has no appeal process other than the hope maybe they can file something in the courts. But I don't know of any judges that are going to take up and look at the decision. I would urge a 'no' vote on this. I think charter schools have a great place in our educational system. We should embrace them, promote them. Public schools will always be the choice... first choice in our families and our districts. But for those districts who truly need an alternative, and for those families and parents that are looking for an alternative, I think that process of having some sort of appeal mechanism is a good thing. And helps promote charters in general. I'd ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Kalish, for what reason do you rise? In support or opposition?"

Kalish: "I rise in support."

Speaker Davis: "Support. Please proceed."

Kalish: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor
yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Kalish: "Actually I'd like to speak right to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Kalish: "I'm a charter school supporter. I'm an education supporter. And when this Bill came to us in committee we understood that this Bill was going to pass. It's passed in prior iterations in prior years. But what makes this Bill different is the honor of its Sponsor, Chris Welch. He negotiated with respect. He brought everyone into the room to make sure that their... that their, you know, issues would be resolved. As he mentioned in his... in his comments, not

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

everyone was going to be happy. And ISBE, IEA, INCS, they've all agreed that this is probably the best resolution for this piece of legislation. Therefore, because of its Sponsor and how... how he's ushered this through, I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Bourne, do you rise in support or opposition?"

Bourne: "In opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition. Please proceed."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, I want to thank you for sitting down and negotiating on this Bill. I think that your efforts are certainly noticed and appreciated. I do have a couple quick questions though. When the charter school... when this board was created, it's my understanding that ISBE had an appeals route. They did not think that it was the proper place for them to make these decisions. So this board was... was created. Do you think getting rid of it in... through this process creates an appropriate appeals process for these charter schools if they're initially denied by the districts?"

Welch: "So it's my understanding that ISBE never wanted the Charter School Commission to be created. And so, this is something that I have had several conversations with them about. And they welcome the change in the law in bring... to bring this back under their umbrella."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bourne: "So the appeals process in your Bill is not for new charter schools who are denied, but for ones that are repealed or revoked. Is that correct?"

Welch: "That is correct."

Bourne: "Okay. To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Bourne: "I... I appreciate the Sponsor's willingness to work on this Bill. I still think, as Representative Sosnowski said so well, when school districts, or communities, or parents are looking to open a new charter school, having an appeals route, if they're denied by the local school district, is still of great value and something that I think we need to offer to those parents, and students, and their communities. So I would ask that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, do you rise in support or opposition?"

Batinick: "Opposition, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition. Please proceed."

Batinick: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Hey, Representative, looking dapper as always.

Question for you. Can you tell me how many... how many charter schools were opened via the route through the commission? You know where it's denied at the school board level and then we opened up... it's a pretty rare occurrence, right?"

Welch: "It's happened one too many times. Even recently where a couple weeks ago the Chicago Public Schools had decided to close a couple of charters that were poorly performing. And the Charter School Commission overturned the local board's

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

decision and continued to allow these poor charters to operate."

Batinick: "Hey couple questions. Do you know... do you have a... a number for me?"

Welch: "I don't have the exact number."

Batinick: "I... I'm being told it's somewhere near seven. My question with that..."

Welch: "That's... that's about right."

Batinick: "You're saying that the poor schools... are people in neighborhoods forced to go to charter schools?"

Welch: "Do people what?"

Batinick: "Are people in certain areas forced to go to a charter school?"

Welch: "Are they forced to go?"

Batinick: "Correct."

Welch: "They are not forced to go."

Batinick: "My question about that... and the reason is that you're saying that those schools are poor. Parents have a choice they have to choose, they have to make the decision to take their kids out of a traditional school and put the child in a charter school. So if it was a poor performing school why do... why would you think that parents would do that?"

Welch: "So first of all, Representative, this is not a Bill that's against choice. I sat down with the parties in a room and this Bill protects the charter schools that are in existence. If this was about taking away choice, we would just put a Bill on the board and we'd get rid of those charter schools as well. That's not what this is about. This is about respecting and honoring the decision of locally elected

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

school boards. In my community and yours just last week school boards were elected. Every two years they are heartily contested races. The people speak and when that local board sits down and vets that decision on whether to approve or deny a charter, what this Bill says is we're going to respect the decision of the locally elected school board. To frame this as choice versus anti-choice..."

Batinick: "Oh I'm not. That's actually not where I was going. And I'll let you finish if you want to but..."

Welch: "Go right ahead. Since that's not where you're going."

Batinick: "Yeah. No, my point was is you're saying it's a poor school but one... one of the benefits of having charter school system is... is if people don't go to that school it's going to close on its own, right? So if it's a poor school why would parents choose... we're trying to give options to parents here obviously. And if it's a poor school why would the parents choose to send their kid to a poor school if they already have option B? Which is what we're going to force by closing that school. I would think that there'd be kind of a self-limiting factor where if charters schools were poor in certain situations they would close on their own just by parents choosing not to send their kids to them. I guess that... that's the direction I was going."

Welch: "Is that a question?"

Batinick: "It is... 'cause you're saying it's a poor school. Why do... why do parents send their kids to those schools then?"

Welch: "I'm not saying it's a poor school. As in the case of CPS recently, they said it was a poor school and they thought that there were better options available for those parents."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Batinick: "CPS said it was a poor school, right?"

Welch: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. So CPS says it's a poor school. CPS is a huge, huge, absolutely huge school district. We're talking about maybe having... you know, breaking up in 21 commissioners. It's not similar to, you know, my school district. I can walk over to my school board member's house. I can see them at the grocery store, I can talk to them. If I go to a school board meeting I have the ability to ask them any question I want. Obviously at CPS it's a little bit different. I mean you're talking about being on the school... it's almost like the congressional level. There's certainly some distance, but there's a big difference between being a school board member at the City of Chicago and being a school board member at the some of the small... smaller downstate and suburban areas where there's that... that easy interaction. I guess my... my point is that the ultimate person to decide is the child and the parent. And if the child and the parent are both wanting to school... I'd send kids to that really appreciate... Representative Chesney if you wouldn't mind moving a little bit. If the parent and the child want to send their kid to that school there's a reason that they're making... making that decision. I'm not going to belabor this point with you. I'm sure you're going to have some other people speak in support. So I'll just go head and move to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Batinick: "And that's... that's really the fundamental... fundamental thing that's happening here. I mean at CPS it is a huge school district where you don't have the sort of access that you

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

have at some of these other districts. There might be another way to come up with a solution. I do appreciate... I know the Representative has been working on this for an incredibly long time. But nobody forces people to go to these schools. And if the parents want to fight for a school and send their kid there I don't think it should be up to, you know, a distant government body to decide that they're just going to go ahead and close that school. So for those reasons, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative McCombie, we've had three speakers opposed to it, for what reason do you rise?"

McCombie: "I support."

Speaker Davis: "Support. Please proceed."

McCombie: "All right. Thank you. Thank you, Representative. I know over the last couple years you have been working on this and trying to come to the perfect Bill. And I know there is some... certainly some debate on... on school choice. And I think that we can all agree that school choice is... is correct. But another thing that we also always agree on is that our elected officials are put into place for a reason. Would you agree with that?"

Welch: "What's your question?"

McCombie: "Would you agree that we, as elected officials, were put into place to... to vote for our constituents?"

Welch: "Absolutely agree to that."

McCombie: "And as an elected school board... and I think they're all soon going to be elected school boards... that we'll be able to have those decisions on our school boards. It's not your intent to have a school board shutting down and not

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

accepting charter school applications, correct? And renewals?"

Welch: "That's... that's not my intent. I do believe that elected school boards will honestly sit down and go through their procedures and vet these proposals thoroughly."

McCombie: "Okay. And so... so you just want to keep... from my understanding of the Bill, you just want to keep it at the local level at the school boards rather than at the state board. Is that correct?"

Welch: "That's correct."

McCombie: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Myers-Martin, we've had three speak in favor and three speak opposed. For what reason do you rise?"

Meyers-Martin: "Is it allowable to have a question for Representative Welch?"

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Meyers-Martin: "Thank you. In the fourth Amendment, Representative Welch, it speaks about reasonable options for transportation, in the event that the school board revokes the license of a charter school. I just needed some clarity on what reasonable options would be simply because it could be many miles in terms of distance to find a comparable or better school."

Welch: "So an answer to your question, Representative... and that's an excellent question because under existing law if a student lives, I believe, more than a 1.2... 1.5 miles away the district would have to provide transportation. And so, we believe that that is a reasonable standard. And if, in the case of the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

charter school, transportation is needed, if they're 1.5 miles or more transportation... the charter school should pay for the transportation."

Meyers-Martin: "So they would... if they could not provide the reasonable transportation they would have to revisit their revocation of that charter?"

Welch: "I'm not quite... not quite clear on the answer to that question. I don't believe... restate your question, Representative."

Meyers-Martin: "Okay. In your fourth Amendment it states that if the school board revoked the charter of the charter school they would be responsible for reasonable options for transportation for those students who attended that school to a comparable or better school."

Welch: "If the transportation... if they live more than 1.5 miles away from the school that they would be attending the district would still have to provide transportation."

Meyers-Martin: "I'm sorry, could you say that again?"

Welch: "If a charter is revoked and the alternative school that the student would be attending is still 1.5 miles away from their residence, the district would be responsible for providing that transportation cost."

Meyers-Martin: "Okay. But if it were more than 1.5 miles?"

Welch: "The district would be responsible for that transportation cost."

Meyers-Martin: "The district would be responsible?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Meyers-Martin: "Okay. Thank you."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Welch to close."

Welch: "Mr. Speaker, when we started these negotiations I actually had hair. And you can see I look like you now. It was a tough negotiation. And you know, this has been going on for a number of years and we finally got there. And I think if you look at your analysis you will see that INCS is not in opposition to this Bill. They've gone neutral and that's a result of the hard work that has been put in. I do understand that Noble Charter Schools and the Charter School Commission are still opposed. But no one is completely happy with the result of this. That's what happens when you get in a room and do a real hard negotiation. We have protected and provided an appeals route for existing charter schools. But these locally elected school districts outside of Chicago who have elections every two years... and these are hard fought issues in those elections... their decisions are going to be respected and if there's... if there's a question about the process there is a right to go on to court. I think this is the best result for everybody. It was fair. It was honest. It was hard fought. And I would ask for a 'yes' vote in favor of House Bill 2100."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2100?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bristow, Buckner, Keicher, Thapedi, West, Williams. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, having received 72 'yes' votes, 33 'no' votes, 2 votes voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- passed. House Bill 269, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 269, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Hoffman on House Floor Amendment #1."
- Hoffman: "Yes. House Floor Amendment #1 basically makes several changes that were requested by the Workers' Compensation Commission and its Executive Director. And we discussed it in committee, I believe it passed unanimously. And I ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Hoffman moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the… and the Floor Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 269, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was brought to me by the Landscape Association. And what they are attempting to get at is the issue of... of companies when they don't have workers' compensation insurance. This would provide for and clarify how the work-stop order would be handled and how the notice

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

would be given. It also insures that... it sets up a procedure so you can issue that. And it also makes a... an audit finding... it fixes an audit finding concerning the Self-Insurers Security Fund. This has been signed on by... signed onto by the Workers' Compensation Commission."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you rise? In opposition or..."

Wheeler: "Actually question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Davis: "Do you rise... this is on Short Debate."

Wheeler: "It is on Short Debate. Yes, I understand."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition?"

Wheeler: "No, I'm in support of the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Okay, support. Well, he is actually the only speaker in support."

Wheeler: "Well then..."

Speaker Davis: "Would you like to move to Standard Debate?"

Wheeler: "Sure."

Speaker Davis: "Move to Standard Debate. Please proceed."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative, we talked about this Bill in committee a little bit. We also you and I talked offline. The initial Bill had some pretty substantial penalty enhancements. And so, that's no longer in the Bill. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "The... I'm checking to make sure but..."

Wheeler: "Thank you."

Hoffman: "...the... what happened is... what we're trying to do is just make sure that individuals who are on a job who don't have

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Workers' Compensation Insurance that there's a mechanism by which they... to make sure that they get it. And that... that was the mechanism that was in place."
- Wheeler: "Yeah. No, that goes back to the genesis of the Bill. I think you and I both have talked to the general... the Landscape General Contractors Association and the Landscapers Contractors Association. And they were trying to find a way to take care of the people who abuse this system. And don't compete fairly with other contractors who actually are following the Workers' Compensation rules the way they're intended to be and protect their workers. Is... is that an accurate reflection?"
- Hoffman: "Yes, it is. And it's also, I think, to make sure that the economies that these folks deal in that they're on a level playing field."
- Wheeler: "Precisely. And we agree that that's an important element we want to get right about this. And the initial version of the Bill had a fair amount of opposition and with the Floor Amendment that opposition's gone neutral. Is that also accurate?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. That's my understanding."
- Wheeler: "Okay. Then that's my understanding as well that's... I mean..."
- Hoffman: "I know like the… my analysis doesn't really indicate but I know like the Manufacturers' Association is neutral on the Bill."
- Wheeler: "Yeah, that's how my analysis looks... I mean it's neutral with the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. And just to return back to the first question that I asked you regarding those

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- increases in fines. Those are removed from the… they're still there?"
- Hoffman: "They still are there. I apologize. They still are there."
- Wheeler: "Okay. But yeah... really we're taking the situation and applying it just to the guys who are really are abusing the system. That's what this is intended for, right?"
- Hoffman: "Yes. And... and the fines and the threshold were signed off by the commission. And they're only for the most serious types of offenses."
- Wheeler: "And, Jay, if you could just outline the change that's going to expedite some of the processes that we've seen delay righting the system for some of the contractors who've... who've felt that they were being competed unfairly with by other operations who were, you know, buying insurance for a month and then never paying the premium and pretending they still have workers' compensation insurance for their workers."
- Hoffman: "So, what this does, currently if an investigator finds that someone is working without insurance they would have to get three of the commissioners of the Workers' Compensation Commission together. In order to sign off on some type of a stop-work order. This makes it one. Now I did indicate to you and I'm going... I'm going to talk to the commission as to whether or not... whether or not we should have more but they could do it telephonically. And I'm... I'm going to talk to them about their thoughts about that. So this reduces the number of commissioners it takes to issue a stop-work order."

Wheeler: "All right. Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Wheeler: "I appreciate the work that the Sponsor has done here to get things in a better place. And the fact that he worked to get the Bill to the point where the IMA is neutral on the language. I intend to support the Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 269?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 104 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2562, Representative Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2562, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "Thank you. So House Bill 2562 creates the Public Defender Quality Defense Task Force. And so, the idea behind this Bill is that obviously public defenders have an incredibly important role in our democracy. We promise that people have a quality defense and yet our public defenders are way over tasked and overworked. So the task force that will be created from this would create a optimal workload recommendation. And so, we have listed out who would be part of the task force. And the intent of the Bill is to have very little financial impact. So the only responsibility for the agency would be to provide space for meetings and some minimal oversight of making sure the meetings happen. So that is the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- intent of the Bill, and it passed unanimously out of committee. And I request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2562?' All in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative DeLuca, for what reason do you rise?"
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you please let the record reflect that on House Bill 2100 I intended to vote 'yes'?

  Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "The record will so reflect. House Bill 2512, Representative Mazzochi. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2512, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Mazzochi."
- Mazzochi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present HB2512 as amended. This is my second transparency Bill, and this one relates to higher education. So one of the higher education trends is to publish a very high tuition list rate but then behind the scenes provide heavy discounts. And this creates real world problems for students and parents when they're trying to assess and compare colleges because they can't get a sense of really what it is they're going to need to pay. So what our... what this Bill does is ask our four year public universities who already prepare a tuition and fee waiver

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

report to also include within it a description of the actual percentage of degree seeking students paying 75 percent, 50 percent, 25 percent of the tuition rates after you consider grants, financial aids, and fee waivers. And also since several Members of the Assembly have stated that they have difficulty getting this type of fee waiver report from the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Bill explicitly states the report will, in fact, be given to all of the Members of the General Assembly. So with that, I ask for an 'aye' vote. And I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ammons, do you speak in favor?

This Bill is on Short Debate. Or opposed?"

Ammons: "I speak in favor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "I'll allow it. Please proceed."

Ammons: "Thank you, just a very quick congratulations to the Representative. And thank her for working with us to make this a better Bill, to make sure that it is doing exactly what she wants it to do. And that we cover all the angles so that the Members of the General Assembly receive a good qualified report. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Thank you, Representative. Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2512?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gong-Gershowitz, Morgan, West. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, the vote is 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2244,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Representative Evans. Out of the record. House Bill 94, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 94, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 94... House Bill 94 is addressing long term sentences for individuals that went into the Illinois Department of Corrections before 1998, before our Truth-In-Sentencing laws. And what the Bill does is allow individuals to become eligible for sentencing credits. I'm working with Department of Corrections, State's Attorneys Association, and also there's another entity I'm also working with on this Bill. I believe it's the PRB. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill is on Short Debate, do you rise in opposition?"

Batinick: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I really can't tell from that description what the Bill does. I'm guessing I'm going to be opposed but I need a few more questions asked... asked and answered."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "Sponsor yield? He indicates he will."

Batinick: "Representative, I think you said who you were working with. I think the DOC is still opposed, correct?"

Slaughter: "Yeah, they're still opposed. We're working with the Prisoner's Review Board, the State's Attorneys Association, and the Department of Corrections on this. They were... they gave me the okay to get this Bill out of the House. But what

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

we're looking at here is how this is going to interface here with the Victims' Rights Act. What the Bill is doing is allowing folks that went into the Illinois Department of Corrections the ability to become eligible for sentencing credits."

- Batinick: "I missed that last phrase. For people who went into the Department of Corrections become eligible for what?"
- Slaughter: "Prior to 1998, individuals that went into the Illinois Department of Corrections, this Bill will give them the eligibility to enter into certain programs to lower their... to give them sentencing credits."
- Batinick: "Okay. So this is kind of an ability for inmates to lower their sentences, is what this does?"
- Slaughter: "Sentence reduction, that's right."
- Batinick: "And you said you were working with a whole... a whole bunch of organizations to get this Bill right?"
- Slaughter: "Well they totally understand what the Bill does. There was a need for a little bit more time on this just to clarify how the mechanics of this Bill will interface with the Victims' Rights Act."
- Batinick: "Okay. Do you know if your Caucus is united on this Bill, Representative?"
- Slaughter: "Are they united? Yes."
- Batinick: "Do you expect unanimous approval from your Caucus is what I'm asking?"
- Slaughter: "It's... I don't know it's tough on these sorts of Bills, Representative."
- Batinick: "Okay. Okay. Just to the Bill. I think we... we kind of have an explanation on what the Bill does now. Everybody can

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

vote their switches how they wish. This was a shell Bill that was just a gut and replace so we... we didn't have as much time to catch up to it. I really think we should be doing the work of the House in the House and sending over perfection to the Senate because we can't trust them over there on that side of the building. So for those reasons, I urge everybody to be cautious. Thank you."

- Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter to close."
- Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And remember this is not addressing our Truth-In-Sentencing policies. This is prior to 1998, prior to our Truth-In-Sentencing laws. And again, this is not allowing these individuals to get out into the community on parole or anything like that. This is allowing them to be eligible for sentencing credits. I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House 94... House Bill 94 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Arroyo, Cabello, DeLuca, D'Amico, Demmer, Flowers, Greenwood, McSweeney, Spain, Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Slaughter."
- Slaughter: "There you go. May I please have Postponed Consideration, Mr. Speaker? Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "This Bill will be placed on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2244, Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2244, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Speaker Davis: "Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "Thank you so much. House Bill 2244 is a Bill that passed out of committee unanimously and has bipartisan support. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2244?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Butler, Carroll, Connor, Grant, Mazzochi, Tarver, Turner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 62 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2397, Representative McCombie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. "
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2397, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McCombie, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative McCombie on House Floor Amendment #1."
- McCombie: "This Amendment removes the opposition of IDOT. It's...

  IDOT will not be the one issuing the aviation decals, it will

  now be the Experimental Aircraft Association."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative McCombie moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair... in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2397, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative McCombie."

- McCombie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a constituent request wanting to create, for aviation enthusiasts, a license plate decal to promote recreational aviation. There is no opposition. And I request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2397?' And on the question... all those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cabello, Gordon-Booth, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1115, Representative Ammons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1115, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. This Bill was read a second time a... previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Ammons, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Ammons on House Floor Amendment #3."
- Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #3 reflects the language that I negotiated with the Illinois Department of Corrections to make changes to the use of electronic

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

monitoring. And I ask for an 'aye' vote in adoption of Amendment 3."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Bryant. Representative Ammons moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1115, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1115, Amendment 3 that we just adopted addresses concerns that were raised by people who were getting out of Department of Corrections on electronic monitoring. The version of this Bill basically gives reforms that we worked out with the Department of Corrections for the use of electronic monitoring so that we can make sure that it is not abused and that the people who are on it are on it for corrective measures. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Bryant, this Bill is on Short Debate. Do you rise in opposition?"

Bryant: "No, I rise in support."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Bryant: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Bryant: "Thank you. Representative, thank you for all the work that you've done on this. I know that there were specific

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

things that both I and parole asked you to do. I know that the parole board is still in opposition. And I want my colleagues to know that you and I are continuing to talk about this. It is... is it your intention on the other side then to also continue to try to get this as an agreed Bill at some point if possible?"

Ammons: "If there's a possibility. I think, as you know and I've been in communication with you and several Members, that my attempt to work with the PRB was not successful because what they would like to do is keep complete control over this process. And that does not bring about the changes that we discussed and we discussed with the Department of Corrections. If it's possible I will work with the Senate Sponsor to get a reasonable move on this Bill, if the PRB is willing to do that. But we are unwilling... and I want to make sure that I'm putting it correctly, we are unwilling to give complete discretion to them, outside of what we agreed and they testified, too, for which this Bill reflects before the Members of this House."

Bryant: "Thank you. And I'd like to offer my... time to help you work on that as well. And, Mr. Speaker, could we move this to Standard Debate?"

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate."

Bryant: "Thank you. So for my colleagues here, I just want them to know that I am going to support you in this as we move across to the other chamber to try to get this maybe situated a little better so some more folks can be happy with us on it. But I'm happy to support to you today."

Ammons: "Thank you very much."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Moving to Standard Debate. We have... there will be one more speaking in favor, three speakers in opposition.

Representative Parkhurst, for what reason do you rise?"

Parkhurst: "Thank you. I rise in opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition."

Parkhurst: "Representative, as we discussed... discussed in committee. I appreciate what you're doing. And I think that you've drawn attention to this matter. And I just don't think that the Bill is ready. I think that it needs more work. One of my concerns is that the only set of crimes that this involves... that is accepted from this electronic monitoring is sexual predators of children. It doesn't deal with like serial rapists for adults, murder, other very serious crimes. And so, I think that it still needs some more work and I hope that you would continue to work on that. I would urge a 'no' vote at this time just because I don't think that the Bill is ready. But I do appreciate what you're doing and it is bringing light to an important situation that does need to be resolved. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Windhorst, for what reason do you rise?"

Windhorst: "I rise in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition. Please proceed."

Windhorst: "My concerns are similar to those expressed by Representative Parkhurst. The number of offenses..."

Speaker Davis: "Speaking to the Bill?"

Windhorst: "Speaking to the Bill. I'm sorry... sorry, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to the Bill. My concern is with the offenses that are not included and that eliminates their inclusion by the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Prisoner Review Board. Those include terrorism, home invasion, first-degree murder, armed robbery, armed violence, armed habitual criminal, aggravated vehicular hijacking, aggravated discharge of a firearm, aggravated kidnapping, aggravated arson. I believe that the Prisoner Review Board should still maintain the discretion to allow for electronic monitoring in those situations. And I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ammons to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to speak... and I usually don't this but I will speak to one thing that was just raised as I close. Not only did we reach out to the Prisoner Review Board, I've sent them emails communications. So that they can send me whatever other language and concerns that they have. They brought this to committee this morning. And I want to make sure that our Members understand, that in response to what was just read it is untrue that they will not be able to use electronic monitoring for some of those provisions. But I would like to say that we should not further criminalize people who have already served their time and we have to make sure that we are not continuing to violate their rights. And so, I will continue to work with the PRB over in the Senate to see if we can come up with some other changes that would be in the best interest of the State of Illinois. And I do urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1115 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all

40th Legislative Day

- voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Crespo, DeLuca, Harris, Kifowit, Wehrli, Welter. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Representative Ammons."
- Ammons: "Mr. Speaker, if we can Postponed Consideration on the matter?"
- Speaker Davis: "Bill is on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 3068, Representative Costa Howard. Out of the record. House Bill 2856, Representative D'Amico. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2856, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative D'Amico, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative D'Amico on House Floor Amendment #2."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We adopted this Amendment in committee, do I need to adopt it on the floor as well?"
- Speaker Davis: "Yes, we do. Please, on the Amendment."
- D'Amico: "The Amendment is technical in nature. I'd wish an 'aye' vote to adopt it."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative D'Amico moves that we... that the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2856. In the... all in favor say 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'... excuse me say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2856, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2856 requires the Secretary of State to implement electronic title system. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill is on Short Debate."
- Batinick: "Yeah, real quick. I'm sorry. I was catching up with this, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple clarification questions."
- Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."
- Batinick: "Representative, how... in all honesty, how do you pronounce your last name?"
- D'Amico: "D'Amico."
- Batinick: "D'Amico, that's what I thought. Okay. And you're carrying a Secretary of State Bill I see. That's interesting.

  Is that new?"
- D'Amico: "It's the first one."
- Batinick: "The first one. Great. Can you clarify exactly what it did... I actually had somebody whispering in my ear that this is a really good Bill but we're catching up on the Amendments. What exactly does this do with your final Amendment?"
- D'Amico: "It just makes the Secretary of State implement an electronic title system. This was previously passed in the year 2000. And we're just... they're just catching up to it right now. We want to get this implemented and get it up and running."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Batinick: "So we passed this in 2000 and still haven't implemented it?"

D'Amico: "Correct."

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, Representative D'Amico to close."

D'Amico: "Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2856 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Caulkins. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2173, Representative Halpin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2173, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved... for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Davis: "Are you going to handle the Floor Amendment, Representative?"

Halpin: "I believe so."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed on the Amendment."

Halpin: "Thank you. And just to clarify, Mr. Speaker, we're on House Amendment 2 right now, correct?"

Speaker Davis: "Floor Amendment #2."

40th Legislative Day

- Halpin: "All right. So Floor Amendment 2 is a technical Amendment that corrects a drafting error. I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Halpin moves that the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2173. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Halpin on House Floor Amendment #3."
- Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment 3 is also technical. And it seeks to require the Illinois Insurance Guaranty Fund to seek reimbursement for litigation costs when it recovers from a high net worth insured. I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Halpin moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2173, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Halpin."
- Halpin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2173 is an initiative of the Illinois Insurance Guaranty Fund. When an insurance company becomes insolvent the Guaranty Fund steps in to pay

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

claims against those insurers. All the insurers in the state contribute to this Guaranty Fund. What this Bill does is it prevents a title... or sorry, Insurance Guaranty Funds from being diverted to pay fines and penalties of the insolvent insurer. It allows the Insurance Guaranty Fund to borrow money for cash flow purposes and borrow at lower interest rates. It allows them to not only recover reimbursement when it's owed from a high... large deductible and high net worth insureds, but also voids settlement agreements that those insureds may enter into with an insolvent insurer. Further strengthens the Insurance Guaranty Fund's ability to pay claims and later seek those reimbursements. And allows the fund's ability to directly obtain custody control of necessary claims information so that they can quickly pay claims and make sure that claimants are covered. And I will reluctantly answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 465?' All those in favor... excuse me. The question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2173?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Harris. Walker. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 465, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 465, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Harris, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Harris on House Floor Amendment #2."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill... Amendment #2 to House Bill 465 is the result of a negotiation with all the stakeholders from the communities of the pharmacy benefit managers, insurers' community advocates, pharmaceutical industry, and pharmacists. It removes opposition from the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Harris moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 465, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 465 establishes a regulatory scheme for pharmacy benefit managers, PBMs, here in the State of Illinois. We're following in the footsteps of other states such as Ohio, Florida, Kentucky, Virginia, Texas, California which have begun to regulate PBM practices, establish fair practices, pricing transparency to prohibit certain anticonsumer practices. And also prohibit practices that unfairly

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

target independent, locally owned businesses. It's a very complicated Bill. I won't go through every facet of it. I would be happy to answer questions. And I would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, do you rise in support or opposition?"

Batinick: "Opposition-ish so nobody else speaks."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition-ish. Please proceed."

Batinick: "Representative, I just want to confirm here we moved a whole bunch of opposition with your hardwork?"

Harris: "Yes. The PBMs, the PCMA, and the Life Insurance Association have now gone neutral with the changes in Amendment #2."

Batinick: "Okay. Fantastic that's... that's good to hear. That may change where I end up on this one. And lastly, we did the hard work here in the House. And we're just going to pass it as is in the Senate is kind of the agreement, right? This is the final product we're looking at here?"

Harris: "That is my understanding."

Batinick: "That's good, the final product is here in the House.

Excellent. Thank you for answering my questions. You have saved me, Sir."

Harris: "Saved us both."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Harris to close."

Harris: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 465?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

voted who wish? Caulkins. Swanson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2691, Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2691, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez, L.: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 2699 would create the Retention of Illinois Students in Equity, also known as the RISE Act, to ensure financial aid equity for minority and marginalized young people. The legislation would expand access to state aid by increasing the credit hour limit in place that disproportionately locks out African Americans and other people of color from state aid. In 2018, 1700 students who applied for the Monetary Award Program, MAP, were denied because they had surpassed the current credit hour limit. Oftentimes students who come from inadequately funded school districts have to take additional course work to catch up to their peers, which is why they reach the credit hour threshold much quicker. The RISE Act would also allow Illinois students who are undocumented to be eligible for state aid, as well as transgender students who do not register for required military purposes as a result and are ineligible for federal aid. We are talking about more or less 3 thousand to 3,500 students per year. This Bill creates equity. The state has already invested in these students through their education. They are residents of Illinois. Universities across the state

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

and community colleges are supportive of this Bill. This is a solution that is the best interest of the State of Illinois and the communities we all represent. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Cassidy, for what reason do you rise?"

Cassidy: "In support of the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "In support. Please proceed."

"Thank you. I want to thank the Sponsor for bringing this Bill and for all the work that went into it. This is an inclusive Bill, widely supported by community colleges, universities, and communities across Illinois. And Representative Hernandez mentioned, this is really about protecting the most vulnerable students. And our transgender students are some of the most vulnerable in the state. You know, making sure that folks are able to live authentically and to qualify for financial aid, and protect their identities. Maybe not get outed at school which could put them in danger. Because transgender students have paperwork with different sex and gender identities on their record, any confusion about a student's sex can significantly delay their federal aid. And this Bill will ensure that transgender students who do not register for the Selective Service because of their documentation are eligible to receive financial aid in Illinois. And I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hammond, for what reason do you rise?"

Hammond: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, can we move this from Short Debate to Standard Debate, please?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Standard... Standard Debate."

Hammond: "Thank you. I appreciate it. Will... will the Sponsor

yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Hammond: "Thank you. Representative, you and I have had countless discussions on this. And I certainly understand where your heart is on this Bill but I do have some serious concerns. We... as we do our budget annually and we try wrap our hands around how many MAP grant applicants we currently have and how far we can stretch our dollars, it becomes increasingly more difficult every year. With your Bill, should it pass, that would certainly increase the number of eligible students for our MAP Grant Program. And I have serious concerns about that. In addition to that, your Bill also removes the 75 hour cap under the current MAP grant programming. So under the current MAP grant program an individual, a student after reaching 75 hours of MAP eligibility needs to be determined to be of junior status. This... this Bill would remove that cap. And essentially would take that student into the hours of eligibility that should be reserved... the last 60 hours of eligibility that should be reserved for junior and senior eligibility. I have some real concerns about that. That we are going to have individuals that will go through the cap and still not have achieved that junior status, not have enough eligible hours to complete, and thus not be able to continue their... their four year degree or their five year degree, whatever it might be. So again, I fully understand where your heart is in this. And if we were in a place in the State of Illinois where we had more money, I could certainly

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

understand. But at this point in time I have to stand in opposition. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Villanueva, for what reason do you rise?"

Villanueva: "To the Bill. In... I'm sorry, in support of the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "In support. Please proceed."

Villanueva: "So this is a good Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Bill... to the Bill?"

Villanueva: "Yeah, to the Bill."

Davis: "To the Bill."

Villanueva: Sorry. I said that before. This is a good Bill. This isn't just about undocumented students. It isn't just about students that are falling outside of the 75 hours or trans students. It's about giving students who are trying to go to school a fighting chance to have access to state grants. It's simple as that. And I, as a person that has an overabundance of student loans, know what it's like to live with that debt on my mind every single day. So this is a good Bill for a lot of students. And it's not a huge amount. We're talking about 3 thousand to about 3500 students in the State of Illinois that just want a fighting chance to be able to go to school and not graduate with a boatload amount of student debt. It's a good Bill and I stand in support. And I urge my colleagues to support this Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Skillicorn, we've had three speak in favor. Are you opposed to this Bill?"

Skillicorn: "Opposed."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

40th Legislative Day

- Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."
- Skillicorn: "Real quick, Representative, how much will this cost the State of Illinois?"
- Hernandez, L.: "It will not cost any more. There's no cost."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. So I'm looking over this Bill and I'm figuring about, say \$9 million according to my figures. Why... why are we so far apart?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Well we're not expanding the program. We're simply... what it's simply calling... this Bill is calling for... or it really exemplifying that there is a demand for these dollars. That's what it's doing."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. And specifically it's the financial note on this Bill that says it \$9 million. And I think that's why we're at a difference. Refresh my memory the Governor's proposed a budget that's not balanced by how many billion?"
- Hernandez, L.: "I'm sorry?"
- Skillicorn: "Refresh my memory. The Governor has proposed a budget that's unbalanced, which is unconstitutional, by how many billion dollars?"
- Hernandez, L.: "You can tell me that."
- Skillicorn: "Okay. So over \$3 billion which is clearly not constitutional. And then we're going to stack another, you know, \$9 million on top of that."
- Hernandez, L.: "This is not adding. It's not adding. This is simply giving opportunity for students to be able to get access to student aid. That's it. It's not adding."
- Skillicorn: "So... but ISAC disagrees in the fiscal note. That's... that's what the issue is here. I'll just quickly read you off

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

here, without additional funding adding new recipients will be adding about \$9 million in annual demand for the program." Hernandez, L.: "It's demand, not cost."

Skillicorn: "Someone's gotta pay for it. Okay. Don't worry... don't worry. To the Bill. We currently don't have a revenue estimate. The Governor predicts revenues going to be \$3 billion than expected spending for next year and that's without this. And... and other information on here even is we're extending the credits for MAP grants. One of the reasons why is that some of the students don't qualify for 100 level classes. Well that's the not responsibility for MAP grant. That's the responsibility for local school districts to graduate students that qualify for college courses. So effectively the people of Illinois are going to pay twice. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, we've had now two speakers in opposition."

Batinick: "Opposition. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition. Please proceed."

Batinick: "And I'll be very brief. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, and... and I just had two quick questions. And I think it was kind of asked by the previous speaker. So we're saying that there's \$9 million of new demands on this? That's the new figure. I'm sorry, you're over there."

Hernandez, L.: "Yes."

Batinick: "It's a big side you guys have over here. I have a hard time..."

40th Legislative Day

- Hernandez, L.: "Exactly. So it's a demand, it's not a cost."
- Batinick: "Okay. So when there's \$9 million more of demand, what happens then if there's no more funding for the system? Does that mean that some people don't get it? Does it get prorated? What's the net effect of the people who are currently in the system now?"
- Hernandez, L.: "It's no different. To this day, I think, we're underfunded and I think we're always going to be underfunded to try to reach all our students. This is just simply opening for a small amount of students to have the opportunity to apply for financial aid. That's all."
- Batinick: "Okay. So some people don't... who qualify don't get MAP grants now 'cause we don't have enough funding. So now there's going to be more people essentially, correct?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Correct."
- Batinick: "Correct. So the last question I have is... is just have you spoken with the Governor's... where's the Governor's Office on this Bill?"
- Hernandez, L.: "I haven't heard from him."
- Batinick: "Have you reached out to him on this Bill?"
- Hernandez, L.: "I haven't heard that they are opposed to it."
- Batinick: "Okay, but have you reached out to him on this Bill?

  No, it's fine it's not the end of the world. So there's been no communication with the Governor's Office on this Bill?"
- Hernandez, L.: "Nope. Nope."
- Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for your answers."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Williams, we have had three speak in favor of the Bill already. Representative Hernandez to close."

40th Legislative Day

- Hernandez, L.: "Thank you for the discussion. We are talking about just 3 thousand to 3,500 students per year. This Bill creates equity. All these… all these students are looking for is an opportunity to continue their education. I think it's upon us to give them that opportunity. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2691 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jones, Lilly, Scherer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 66 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2909, Representative Hurley. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2909, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Martwick, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative, are you handling the Amendment?" Hurley: "Certainly."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Hurley on House Floor Amendment #1."
- Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 just... well let me talk about the Bill. 2909 is an initiative of the Chicago Firefighters Local 2. It's transferring property from the City of Chicago if it discontinues use as it is now. And the Amendment states that if the lessee is not exempt from property taxes they have to property taxes. And if they wish

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

to sale the property it requires three-fifths of a vote of the board. I'm here for questions."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hurley moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2909, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill.

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hurley."

Hurley: "I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Here for questions."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Arroyo, do you rise on this issue?

This Bill is on Short Debate. Do you rise in opposition? No question. Seeing no further discussion, Representative Hurley to close."

Hurley: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "On this question, 'Shall House... shall the House pass House Bill 2909?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Arroyo, Brady, D'Amico, Davidsmeyer, Keicher, Sommer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 104 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"

Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Frese is excused for the rest of the day."

40th Legislative Day

- Speaker Davis: "The record shall so reflect. House Bill 122, Representative Kalish. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 122, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 was adopted previously. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Kalish, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Kalish on House Floor Amendment #3."
- Kalish: "Thank you. House Bill... oh we have to adopt the Amendment?"
- Speaker Davis: "You have to adopt the Amendment."
- Kalish: "Right. Adds the words subject to appropriation. So please
   do so."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Kalish moves that we adopt House Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 122. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And House Bill... excuse me. And House Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 122, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Kalish."
- Kalish: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Bill 122 would create the Office of Ombudsman for Behavioral Health Access. I got this Bill from my sister who is a State Representative in Colorado.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

She passed a similar program last year. It's having a positive impact on the citizens of Colorado. And we felt it could have a positive impact on the citizens of Illinois. We've been working together with the Department of Human Services, as well as the behavioral health networks here in the State of Illinois. All of whom are supportive of the concept. And we are working out some of the details. We expect that the appropriation be somewhere between a 100 and 200 thousand dollars. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick this Bill is on Short Debate. Do you rise in opposition?"

Batinick: "I will be opposition-ish and keep it on Short Debate."

Speaker Davis: "Please... please proceed."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

Representative I appreciate..."

Speaker Davis: "Sponsor indicates he will."

Batinick: "Thank you for slowing me down on that. Representative, we had a small sidebar discussion. We really need a little bit more... well I want to go through some of this is what it does? What you're trying to do? Cost of what you're trying to accomplish? So obviously the first thing I brought up is the fact that there were some... some significant amount, on my side of the aisle, that was against this Bill in committee. Can you explain the opposition in committee? Why they were opposed?"

Kalish: "I believe the opposition in committee was the fiscal note."

Batinick: "Okay. And the fiscal note is... exactly what are we spending here?"

40th Legislative Day

- Kalish: "We're hiring one individual who will work at the department using their resources."
- Batinick: "Okay. And they're using their resources. And what's the dollar amount with that?"
- Kalish: "We estimate the... the fiscal amount in Colorado has been somewhere between 100 and a 150 thousand dollars. I think it's \$108 thousand on their website. We expect it to cost similar amounts here."
- Batinick: "We do seem to spend more than other states on stuff like this. So maybe..."
- Kalish: "Well when we pass cannabis like they do we may have the
   money."
- Batinick: "Yeah. Wow, Rabbi pushing cannabis. So what... what exactly is the ombudsman? How is this working out successfully in Colorado? What... what is going to be the day to day responsibility of this particular individual?"
- Kalish: "The day to day responsibilities of that ombudsman is to be a neutral party to help consumers. That's what an ombudsman does. They help consumers access care. They will work together with individuals who contact them to help them find the right places to go to get coverage and support for mental health services."
- Batinick: "So and... and I'm thinking this through here. One person?

  People from the state will be contacting this one person without any staff, to help them with direct... direct mental health services? They don't work through agencies, they're actually working with people in need on their own?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Kalish: "They're working... right now... right now we have it as they are working on their own. That is correct. It will be an overwhelming position for the individual."

Batinick: "Okay. So what is the population of the State of Colorado?"

Kalish: "I have no idea."

Batinick: "Okay. My guess is it's about a third our population."

Kalish: "I... I would probably guess... agree with you."

Batinick: "So we probably have three times the workload. I mean realistically this might take three times the effort."

Kalish: "This... this may take more than one person."

Batinick: "Okay. And lastly, I believe at this time this is subject to appropriation, correct?"

Kalish: "That's correct."

Batinick: "So there... we have the ability to not fund this. It won't be done and there will be no fiscal impact."

Kalish: "That's correct."

Batinick: "Have you spoken to the Governor's Office about this Bill?"

Kalish: "We have not spoken to the Governor's Office. But myself and Senator Fine, who's sponsoring in the House, expect to have a full discussion with the Governor's Office moving forward."

Batinick: "Okay. And... and just for purposes of being transparent, there's 5.61 million people in Colorado, which is almost half of what we have not quite one-third. We're not quite three times as large. I'm... I'm just going to tell everybody on my side of the aisle vote your district, watch your switches. And thank you for answering my questions."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Kalish: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Kalish to close."

Kalish: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 122?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Batinick, Grant, Jones, Sommer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 79 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1440, Representative McDermed. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1440, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative McDermed."

McDermed: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1440 is a Bill that brings forward the recommendations of the Sexual Assault Evidence Tracking Commission. This was created in an earlier Assembly and finished its work last summer. There were a number of recommendations of the commission that called for legislative changes including, mandatory participation in the tracking system for everyone that touches the kit. So for example, the medical professionals and law enforcement and state's attorneys, and of course the ISP who will be hosting the program. The other thing that is does is it exempts this information from FOIA, which I think is very important to protect victims of sexual assault. The Bill includes some recommendations now made from the Senate, when the version was over there, to put some of the work of the commission,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

the report into the Bill so that it's saved for the legislative history. This is a good Bill because all of us know that if you don't measure it and track it you will not get the behavior we want. We want the kits to be handled appropriately, expeditiously. And for victims to have access to the information, which they will, the system will provide for secure access for victims to their own information, where the kit is in the process. And by tracking this on a going forward basis we'll make sure that we don't slip into any old ways that do not benefit victims. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 1440?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Guzzardi, Moylan, Swanson, Williams. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 112 Members voting 'yes', O voting 'no', O voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2247, Representative Lilly. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2247, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lilly, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Lilly on House Floor Amendment #1."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. We've been working on this legislation for a little bit now. And it's so important that we address the needs and the concerns of our constituents

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

and the citizens of Illinois. And this is a community-based pilot program that allows individuals, persons in need of mental health, counseling, psychiatry services to have access to them close to their homes and in their neighborhoods. It is a pilot program supported by the Illinois Department of Human Services. And we're excited about putting this... bringing this forward and putting this in the communities where the people are in most need. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Lilly, was that... did that discussion include the Amendment?"

Lilly: "Yes."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Lilly moves that we adopt House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2247. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion... in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2247, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Yes. The Department of Human Services, along with many of the Members of the Mental Health Committee, all agree that having a pilot program of this nature to assist families and individuals with their counseling needs and their mental health needs is something that we need to make sure we're moving forward here in the State of Illinois. Without further questions... if there's no further questions, I ask for an 'aye' vote. "

40th Legislative Day

- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2247?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bailey, Butler, Grant, Halbrook, McDermed. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3606, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3606, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Martwick, has been approved consideration."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Martwick on House Floor Amendment #3."
- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment 3 makes a number of changes. It is a gut and replace. It takes the modifications that were in Floor Amendment 2 and it adds them, extends the breach notification period. It exempts nonpublic schools from the data privacy... Student Data Privacy Act. It changes posting requirements and a number of... there are seven specific changes but there are also changes that were contained in previous Amendments. Happy to answer any questions. Ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Martwick moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #3. Representative Williams, did you want to... he moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

#3. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And House Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3606, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you give me one second to get my... thank you. House Bill 3606 is a Student Data Privacy Act. It is a method... it creates legislation around the concept of protecting, securing data that is collected from students throughout the educational process. It does a number of things. It ... it gives families the ability to know what data is being collected on their children, by whom and for what purpose. It ensures that data sharing can only happen under a written agreement so that parents can track who has their child's data and what's happening to it. It gives peace of mind that data is being stored and transmitted following specific standards and safeguards and that they're notified when student data held by companies and schools is breached. And it gives parents the ability to review the data that is corrected from their children and correct errors and have it deleted if necessary. These are the key provisions of this Bill. This grew out of the idea that throughout the... the advent of an increased use of technology in schools there have been a number of ... of data breaches. Chicago Public Schools has had six major data breaches since 2015, involving tens of thousands of highly sensitive personal data of

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

students. There is at least nine other incidences of K-12 schools in Illinois outside of Chicago in the last two and a half years, including some ransomware incidents. We have been rated as an F for transparency on student data. And we've been given a D for our data security. This Bill will... has been extensively negotiated with the people who are... who have been opposed to it. So we've worked with School Management. We have worked with the technology companies. And we have arrived at a point that this Bill, I believe, is ready to go. However, I have commitments... I want the Body to know and I think this is important that we have made commitments to all of the interested parties, to continue negotiations in the Senate. I have the commitment of Senator Aquino who will pick up the Bill. And I give my own personal word that we will continue negotiations. But we have made a lot of progress. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wheeler, this Bill is on Short Debate. Would you like to speak in opposition?"

Wheeler: "Actually I'd like to move to Standard Debate, please?" Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate. Please proceed."

Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Wheeler: "Representative, I want to first of all commend for taking on a very difficult task with this Bill."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Wheeler: "I also want to commend you for your willingness to take

Amendments and take them seriously. You showed us in

committee, I believe, a four page piece or packet that

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

explained the different things you've moved on from the beginning of the Bill. Am I right about that?"

Martwick: "That is correct. There have been literally dozens of... of accommodations reached with the concerned parties of this Bill. Many of them have been moved to neutral. The Catholic Conference has been moved to neutral. We exempted... we exempted private schools from this Bill. We have... we have addressed just point after point from both technology and School Management. And really addressed pretty much every concern that's been brought to us. I would venture to say that perhaps not entirely to their satisfaction, but I think to a great extent."

Wheeler: "And I appreciate that. I know that there are different groups that you refer to. And I actually spoke, today, in committee about this Bill and the fact that there still are issues I'd like it to address. I know you made a commitment to work on it in the Senate. I know that, unfortunately, we get to vote on what's in front of us today."

Martwick: "Yes."

Wheeler: "And... I'm guess I'm kind of disappointed that I wish we were further along in the process. I would like to support what you're doing. I just can't do it yet. So with that I'd like to just make a couple of questions for you here. Put them on the record so we can know which direction we're going. If you would, please?"

Martwick: "Okay."

Wheeler: "There were questions brought today about the definition of the word 'breach' and how it's used. Representative, I know that we have other Bills that we're working on that are

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

related to cybersecurity and data privacy that we're hearing today and frequently right now. I would... I wish we could kind of consolidate these definitions so they'd all work together so we had a clearer understanding at the same time. Is there a chance we could do that in the Senate?"

Martwick: "I... I don't know to be honest with you. And the one thing that I would say is, while there are a lot of data security Bills out there, I would suggest that this is very different. Most of the data security Bills that we have relate to adults. This is the one data security Bill that relates to children. And that the reason that I say that's different, Representative, is that the data points are very different. So the data that's being collected by adults is very different than the data that's being elected... collected on children. And so, that's why I think there needs to be sort of a separation. In fact, the motivation for this Bill was that much of the data security law that currently exists addresses situations that don't protect children. And that's why we felt we needed to craft this out."

Wheeler: "And I really appreciate what you're saying on it. And I guess my concern is us looking around at how we enhance compliance? How do we make it easier for this Bill to be complied with so we actually get to the goal that you're aiming at? How do we protect these kids, their data so that parents understand what's going on? And to me if the definitions are in alignment we have a better chance of compliance. That's my suggestion to you."

Martwick: "That is a good suggestion."

Wheeler: "Take it for what you'd like. So..."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Martwick: "Yes, and I will... I give you my word that I will bring that to the Senate Sponsor. And see if there is some way that we can line up those definitions on all of those Bills.

Perhaps a meeting of all of those different Sponsors."

Wheeler: "No, I... again, this is just a suggestion to you my friend. And I... I look forward to seeing where this lands. Again, I support your efforts. I can't support the language yet. But I really do encourage you to keep going. Thank you."

Martwick: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Williams, for what reason do you rise? Do you rise in support? Please proceed."

Williams, A.: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Williams, A.: "Representative, is Comcast opposed to this data security Bill?"

Martwick: "Not... not that I'm aware of."

Williams, A.: "Okay."

Martwick: "No, they did not weigh in on this."

Williams, A.: "But we still have some opposition to the Bill?"

Martwick: "We do, yes."

Williams, A.: "And what is the nature of an opposition to families wanting to protect their children's data from being sold, shared, and manipulated without their permission? What could they possibly be opposed to?"

Martwick: "So it... if I had to speculate... and I think the opponents could speak better to this than I could... but I think ultimately whatever we do... and again, I mentioned that we have made... I have... Representative Wheeler spoke about the four page document that I have here. That... where we addressed

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

a lot of the concerns of these groups. Ultimately whatever we do will be a mandate. And I just think that some of these school groups are in a position where they just will not accept a mandate under any circumstances. It is in their nature that they have to oppose that. But we have gone a long way from... I guess if I could gauge their opposition it is much softer now than it was when we began. Because we... even though I knew that they couldn't ultimately come to a point where they supported it, I still addressed their major concerns."

Williams, A.: "And you've done an amazing job with that. And I found the school groups to be reasonable when it comes to these issues. But the tech companies what... what is the tech company's incentive here? What are they looking for in terms of these student data?"

Martwick: "Well, I mean ultimately we've seen this sort of a trend going on where you have schools that are underfunded, so they look to technology to help close the gap with their resources. And you know, as the old saying goes, if something's too good to be true it probably is. And so, all of this free software that's being offered comes with a price. And that price is the collection and use of that data. And the whole idea behind this Bill is to try and at least... we're not saying that that can't be used. School districts need this and it's a benefit. And the advocacy groups are in full support of that. And they understand the lack of resources, they understand the challenges. But they're saying that at least give us transparency, let us know what's being collected, how it's

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

being used, the ability to correct errors in it, and ultimately if it's breached let us know."

Williams, A.: "Thank you. To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Williams, A.: "On this item and so many other of the data privacy items that we've worked on over the past few years they seem to be... it seems to be death in the details. There's a lot of conversation about this definition and what this means and what that means. But to give you a little history on this Bill, this Bill has been pending, I think, at least for two or three Sessions. And every time we're fighting over a definition, or what's included in this paragraph, or what ... what the repercussions are of this word or that word. But the reality is parents and families have approached me, numerous parents and families, some involved with organizations, some individually with concerns about the fact their children's data and access of school issued computers and even issuance of school issued passwords. That data is then we've lost the proprietariness... I don't know if that's a word... we've lost the data to the companies that provide this technology. This is something that apparently is... is happening... well is completely happening to adults all the time. Anyone that uses one of these can just pretty much just forget about their data not being collected without... with their ... with any notifications. But I will say with children this is a whole different conversation. The data that is collected on children should and must be protected. The parents have the right... I would submit and I don't know how anyone here could really disagree that you should not be... you should be able to

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

at least at the very minimum be made aware of when your children's personal data is being collected. And I would submit even further should be notified as to how it's being collected. And also what profit is being made by the companies based on the selling and sharing of your children's data. The term is monetized and it is the new economy. It is the economy of selling and sharing personal data. And I think we need to take serious steps to control it for adults. But I know we need to take serious steps to address it for our children. So I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote. And don't fret over the details. The big picture here is really a big problem. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Martwick to close."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House for the discussion on this. I make no bones about this, this will be a burden. This will be work that needs to be done. This is work that must be done. We... we are in a wild west of data right now in cyber security. We... we don't know what's going on out there. And we, as government, owe a responsibility to the most vulnerable, our children, to protect their data, to make sure that it's not used against them when they become adults. It's time to make progress on this Bill. I... I give my word that we will continue to try to address concerns. I think I've shown in good faith that I'm willing to do that. We'll continue to do it in the Senate. And I hope working together we can come back with a Bill that... that is... makes everyone happy and it's a full vote. I ask for your confidence and your support. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

40th Legislative Day

- Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3606 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
  And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Caulkins, Keicher, Mazzochi, Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 71 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'.
  And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker please let the Journal reflect that Representative Spain is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Davis: "The record shall so reflect. House Bill 2808, Representative Morgan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 280... I'm sorry, 2028. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2028, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, is offered by Representative Morgan."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Morgan on House Floor Amendment #2."
- Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment 2 deals with something the Public Safety Appropriations Committee approved it this morning... I'm sorry, I appreciate everyone's indulgence. This is for burial expenses for law enforcement that had been lost in line of duty. This Bill was passed originally out of committee where we provided an increased benefit for burial expenses for our fallen Illinois State Police Troopers. And I think we all collectively as a Body agreed we needed to change and increase this for all law

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

enforcement that have fallen in the State of Illinois. That's what Amendment 2 does."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Morgan moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House... House Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2028 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2028, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Morgan."

Morgan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if I could have everyone in the chamber's attention for just a moment. This is a Bill, again many of you know, this is legislation that increases the burial expenses allowed for fallen law enforcement, not just Illinois State Police Troopers but also those in local law enforcement and fire who we've lost. We are increasing this burial expense from \$10 thousand to \$20 thousand. It is long overdue. And if you'll indulge me, this legislation will apply to a number of our fallen members that we have addressed before and spoken about and memorialized in this chamber. And I just want to read their names so that everyone knows who this is for. Starting with going back into 2018. It's for Police Officer Samuel Jimenez, Police Officer Conrad Charles Gray, Police Officer Eduardo Marmolejo, Trooper Christopher Lambert, Deputy Sheriff Jacob Howard Keltner, Trooper Brooke Jones-Story, and lastly Trooper Gerald Wayne Ellis. So with this again, this is legislation that will increase the burial

40th Legislative Day

- expenses for those troopers that we have lost in this last year. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2028?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3390, Representative Pappas. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3390, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Pappas."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Pappas on House Floor Amendment #2."
- Pappas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment just clarifies some of the language. We worked with the fire marshals' as well as the Department of Agriculture to clean up some language. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Pappas moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And House Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

  Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3390, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Pappas."

Pappas: "Thank you. So this Bill arises out of a tragedy that happened just outside of my district where there was a fire in a kennel that held 60 dogs only had a... as required by code, only had a battery operated smoke detector. Unfortunately, there was no one on premises when the fire started and as a result 31 of the dogs perished and many of the others were injured. So this Bill would require a kennel that does not have staff present at all times when animals are on premises to have either a sprinkler system or a fire alarm that directly dispatches to the fire department when activated. I ask for an 'aye' vote. And I'm ready to take questions."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 3390?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Caulkins, Halbrook, Keicher, McDermed, Turner, Ugaste. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 95 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2649, Representative Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2649, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Ramirez."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ramirez on House Floor Amendment #3."

Ramirez: "Amendment 3 is a gut and replacement and the Amendment becomes the Bill. I ask that the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ramirez asks for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'yes'; all the opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2649, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ramirez."

Ramirez: "Thank you... thank you, Speaker. This Bill is a Bill that addresses the impact and it helps us elevate the conversation about children of the incarcerated. This Bill is for A.T., a 16 year old girl who is currently under DCFS care, and the other 186 thousand children right now who have a parent who's incarcerated. A.T. sent me her testimony for committee but I know it's been a long, long day so I won't read it at this moment. House Amendment 3 changes how we originally approached the Bill. Initially we wanted to create a bill of rights requiring correctional agencies to create and implement policies and procedures that take these rights into But consideration. after numerous conversations, negotiations, many, many meetings we have decided to change the bill of rights to guiding principles but more importantly to establish a task force. We are going to be working with law enforcement and other stakeholders. And we're going to

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

work together under the Lieutenant Governor's Office to establish a task force that looks at the impact of children whose parents are incarcerated. The task force will review research, best practices, effective interventions and they will be able to bring that information back to the Body as recommendations. This Bill is incredibly important to me as it is to the advocates who are here today and worked so hard for it. And today, on this Bill, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill is on Short Debate. Would you like to speak in opposition?"

Batinick: "I am in opposition but I might be able to be swayed on this one."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Representative... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, so this was originally a watch list Bill, 12-7 in committee. My understanding, with the Amendment you remove opposition and it was unanimous in committee?"

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Batinick: "Okay. And then is there... does the task force get any pay?"

Ramirez: "It does not. There's no compensation."

Batinick: "No compensation."

Ramirez: "They're all volunteers."

Batinick: "And I heard you mention the Lieutenant Governor's Office. Is that just your plan or have you actually been in conversations with the… the second floor?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Ramirez: "I have been in conversations with the Lieutenant Governor's Office. And they will, in fact, be administering it."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm sorry I didn't... you have or have not?"

Ramirez: "I have... I have."

Batinick: "You have been. Okay. Thank you. So this is a task force that's uncompensated, correct?"

Ramirez: "Say that again. I didn't hear you."

Batinick: "This is an uncompensated task force?"

Ramirez: "This is an uncompensated task force, correct."

Batinick: "Okay, duly noted. Thank you."

Ramirez: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ramirez to close."

Ramirez: "House of Representatives, this is the Bill where I have learned how to negotiate, how to go through endless meetings, how to work with our advocates, but more importantly to focus on our children. This Bill has been a long time in the making. And I'm grateful for everyone that made this task force possible. And all I ask today is an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2649."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2649?' All those... All of those in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Flowers, Mazzochi, Ramirez. Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this vote... on this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Bill 2670, Representative Robinson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2670, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, is offered by Representative Robinson."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Robinson on House Floor Amendment #2."
- Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. This ensures the circumstances surrounding the convictions are considered. It also... a person does not need to wait three years after their conviction to be able to get a license at the state. I worked with the Safer Foundation on this Amendment. I do not have any opposition on this Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, Representative Robinson moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2670, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Robinson."
- Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2670 creates the New Illinois Business Owners' Act. Provides that no applicant for a license for any state or local department, agency, board, or commission shall be denied or acted adversely by any reason the applicant have previously conviction of a

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

criminal offense. Very simply, if someone has a conviction and they have paid their time they should be able to get a state license. This is a very, very simple matter. We need to be able to put people to work to be able to... be able to give taxes back to the state, to be able to provide for their families. I ask for this Body to give an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, and the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2670?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish? Arroyo, Bourne, Brady, Butler, D'Amico, Davidsmeyer, Flowers, McDermed, Sosnowski, Yingling. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 69 Members voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2924, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2924, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Slaughter."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter on House Floor Amendment #2."
- Slaughter: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 adds clarifying language in regards to when the supplier diversity reports will be submitted to the state."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes';

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2924, a Bill for... a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter."

Slaughter: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2924 is... is enhancing our supplier diversity programs regarding the state's large tourist destinations. We've... we've done this initiative for a few industries before, public utilities, hospitals, private higher education, railroads, and also the telecommunications industry. What we've done with this is create an atmosphere for vendor fairs and publish reports. And they've had a tremendous impact on the aggregate spend on MBE and WBE companies. In a collaborative matter the state has helped companies reach and succeed their own supplier diversity goals. House Bill 2924 starts to do this with our larger museums in the Chicagoland industry... Chicagoland area. As well as our two large sports entities associated with the Illinois Facility Sports' Authority, which are the Chicago Bears and the Chicago White Sox. This has been very impactful in the industries that we've done this for. Mr. Speaker, you know that. I urge a 'yes' vote." Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the

House pass House Bill 2924?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Butler, Davis, Williams. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Thapedi, House Bill 2233. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2233, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Mr. Clerk, move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2233, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Thapedi."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Thapedi on House Floor Amendment #1."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment #1 relates to special interrogatories and removes the opposition of the Illinois State Medical Society, the City of Chicago, PACE, and the Illinois Insurance Association. A curious opposition still remains but I move for its adoption and to fully debate it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Thapedi moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2233. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2233, a Bill for an Act concerning civil

law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2233 relates to civil... a civil litigation tool that has become extremely controversial in recent years. tool are called... or they are called interrogatories. Interrogatories in general are questions. Normal interrogatories are governed by the Supreme Court in Supreme Court Rule 213 and are questions that actual parties in litigation ask each other prior to trial during the discovery process. Special interrogatories, which is at issue here however, are governed by us and our creations of statute. These questions are also written by the parties to litigation. However, these questions are actually given to the jury at the time of trial. These are usually in high stakes personal injury litigation. Because of their controversial nature House Bill 2233 initially sought to repeal these special questions or interrogatories that are to be answered by the jury at trial. However, before you are now important revisions to the statute, which does two primary things. First, it codifies modern practice in case law. Second, it further provides guidance to the court, the parties, the parties' attorneys, and most importantly the jury as to the process to be used at trial when special interrogatories are requested by the lawyers for the parties at trial. House Bill 2233 does six specific things. First, it makes clear that the judge has the sole discretion to decide whether or not the jury can be

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

asked these special questions or interrogatories. Second, it makes clear that any party at trial can make the request of the judge to ask the jury any special questions or special interrogatories. Thirdly, it makes clear that the standard of review on appeal is the abuse of a discretion standard. Fourth, it further makes clear that when there's inconsistency between the general verdict of the jury and the jury's answer to a specific interrogatory the judge must send the case back... or strike that, the judge must send the jury back to the jury room to... to resolve the inconsistency and continue deliberating. Fifth, if the judge decides that the jury still cannot reconcile its general verdict with its answers to any special interrogatory, the judge must order a new trial. Finally, the Bill makes clear that the trial attorneys are allowed to explain to the jury during closing happens when its general verdict what inconsistent with its answer to a special interrogatory. In committee this morning, Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Defense Trial Counsel raised a concern and cited a Supreme Court case called Sommese v. Maling Bros. to support their reasoning in opposition to the Bill. That case, however, is not persuasive and does not support their position. The Sommese case is a 1966 slip-and-fall case where one of the issues was whether the plaintiff's counsel made improper arguments to the jury about the defendant's special interrogatory relating to contributory negligence. This Bill actually resolves such an issue by setting forth the process for what lawyers can and cannot say to the jury during closing argument. I'm available to answer any and all questions."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Representative McDermed, this Bill is on Short Debate. Are you speaking in opposition?"

McDermed: "I am. And my first question is can we move it to Standard Debate?"

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate."

McDermed: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

McDermed: "Mr. Chairman, is this an initiative of the Illinois
Trial Lawyers?"

Thapedi: "It is an initiative of the Illinois Trial Lawyers and the Illinois State Bar Association."

McDermed: "Are there not still many, many, many opponents?"

Thapedi: "What is your..."

McDermed: "I could name a few for you."

Thapedi: "Well... well hold on. The many, many opponents that you're referring to are Defense Trial Lawyers. So if you have basically every big defense law firm in the State of Illinois filing a witness slip in opposition then, yeah, you would have many, many folks."

McDermed: "Well, okay. Besides them, which we do have, we have the IMA, IML, CTA, Illinois Chamber, BNSF, American Tort Reform Association, Civil Justice League, METRA, and RTA. That seems like a... kind of a long list to me. There must be a reason that there's still so much opposition."

Thapedi: "Where did you get that list? And you were there with me in committee as well, Leader McDermed, and several of those entities that you just mentioned we never heard from them. And the Bill has been on file for... since the beginning of... of the Session. So some of those folks that you're bringing up

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

now are basically sandbagging us right here on the floor. But that's... that's fine, that's what defense lawyers do sometimes."

McDermed: "My staff has been in touch with all of these people today and they are still in opposition. Isn't it... they slipped... they're slipped in, okay. Isn't it true that one of the reasons that special interrogatories have been such an important tool in civil defense litigation is to try to separate the facts and causation from emotion in deciding verdicts?"

Thapedi: "No."

McDermed: "Okay. I'm going to suggest that, you know, many of the folks that came before us are trying to get to... trying to get juries focused in on what are the elements of the tort that's being discussed and making sure that all the elements exist, regardless of the appeal of the injuries of the plaintiff. But look at was there actual causation by this defendant, by others... certain other defendants, by each of the defendants that are there and that all the elements of the tort exist. Isn't that a good thing that everybody would want to know? Why do we want to eliminate that from our court process?"

Thapedi: "You're... you're mistaken, Leader McDermed. That's why we have jury instructions. That's why there's specific instructions that go back to the jury to walk the jury through exactly what the law is on a particular case and the issues in a case. This special interrogatory is something separate and distinct. So again, what your... your question suggests is... is that the jury is going to walk in and somehow not have a clue as to what the law is, which is not accurate. The jury

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

gets detailed jury instructions to... to use. The special interrogatory only comes into play when one of the parties decides to propound it."

McDermed: "Don't most parties want special interrogatories, especially in larger cases?"

Thapedi: "Most... it would depend on the issue. So to answer your question... to answer your direct question, the answer is no. They're very specific types of cases where you see special interrogatories. And generally it's in high stakes tort litigation."

McDermed: "And isn't that where they're most important? I think that trying to tease apart how juries arrived at their verdict is an important tool that many of the opponents... well all of the opponents are unwilling to lose in this effort. I think the idea of the trial lawyers to try to get a favorable verdict without allowing the curtain to be pulled back is a nice tactic. And I'm not sure that we here in the General Assembly need to change what has been the law here in the State of Illinois for a long time in order to assist trial lawyers in getting larger and more favorable verdicts that can't be overturned. I would very much urge folks here in this room to allow the court process to remain as it is and to vote 'no' on this. And I don't think the trial lawyers need any help from any of us here. They're doing pretty well all on their own. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Mazzochi, for what reason do you rise?"

Mazzochi: "Thank you. I rise both in support and in opposition to the Bill and I'd like to be able to explain why."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Mazzochi: "Thank you. To the Bill. It's my personal belief that we actually don't need to change the current procedures that we have in place right now. One of the things that I have found as a civil attorney is that particularly the more complexity that is added to the case, when the subject matter tends to be more arcane. When them when you have a case that has a multitude of elements that need to be proved and you need to make sure that all of those elements are targeted, particularly in statutory cases and certain tort cases, types of contract cases. Special interrogatories are an invaluable tool and they actually, in my opinion, should be used routinely when you go in front of a jury. Because they do, in fact, I believe, get to a better outcome on the merits. I also believe in... that when it comes to interrogatories ... special interrogatories they also are an important check, in the sense that when an attorney tries to not actually try their case on the merits, but try their case on emotions the special interrogatories usually are a crucial tool that judges can use to make sure that the juries are actually making decisions based truly on what is required by the law, as opposed to just on emotional arguments. And I believe that when there are inconsistencies between a general verdict and a special interrogatory, precisely because the special interrogatories usually are tied towards the legal element, that's where they're at the most valuable in making sure that we truly are having juries decide the real world merits that are actually relevant as a matter of law. That being said, I ... I am willing to consider this particular Bill as its been

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

amended to simply be able to say let's see whether we actually can get to an improved procedure in the context of some of these civil jury cases by putting this in the discretion of the judge. Now what are the types of elements that I think the judge should consider? Exactly the types of things that I've just mentioned. And I'm sure that there will be a whole host of other cases where judges will find a reason to use special interrogatories. In my support of this Bill I want to make it clear that I am not trying to say that judges should stop using special interrogatories in the types of cases that we've been seeing. They should consider it to be something that... that is used routinely as a matter of course. But I recognize that they may not be necessary in very simple cases where our technology is simple, where an issue is simple, and pretty cut and dry and again, doesn't involve a lot of large money damages, or emotional issues, or particularly complicated subject matter. So that is a very long way of saying that I am willing to try this for now. And I would say this, is that if, in fact, we do find or the Trial Bar finds that over the course of the next year or two after this were to go into effect that the use of special interrogatories is down, that it hasn't led to any improvement in judicial outcomes, that we've seen an unexpected rise in the size and scope of damages awards. Then I think it would be appropriate to actually revert back to where we are today. So I am willing to give this a try as its been amended. But again, I just want to make clear that I do think the special interrogatories remain a critical tool that need to be used by judges in jury cases so that you can make sure that the person who is on the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

defense side is not being denied their due process rights and their rights to actually have the case decided on the merits. Thank you very much."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Durkin, for what reason do you rise?"

Durkin: "To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Durkin: "I appreciate the comments that've been made. But I guess the question I have in my mind is that, what wrong are we trying to right with this Bill? Particularly in the State of Illinois. We know what this state is about. Look I'm... I'm in the defense side. I've not done a lot of trial work lately but I know that this is not a state that will lean in the middle. We're a state that is pro-plaintiff. And we've actually been on the ... on the national headlines about what ... what people think about the tort system in Illinois. But here's what I also can see that this type of Bill is going to slow down the movement of cases within our system. By taking this out of... instead of making this a mandatory submission and leaving it to the discretion of the court we are going to be creating a massive backlog and hodgepodge of abuse of discretion appellate opinions all the way up to the Supreme Court. That, folks, is going to put the wheels of justice very slow. And cases will drag through this system because there will be a continuing appeal based on whether the court ruled favorably or ruled based on... had a good basis... a good factual basis or not and whether or not that discretion was proper. And to me that that's not the way to do it. But the best way of doing this is taking it away from us. Folks,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

you've heard us. I don't think there's too many people in here have any idea of what this actually means. And I think most attorneys probably in here don't understand it either. There's a place for this, it's called the Illinois Supreme Court, who promulgates rules about procedure on a regular basis because they know what they're doing. They put practitioners in a room and they work out the details on complicated issues regarding discovery and process and procedure. I'm telling you that there's a better place for this, and it's not here. And I would say vote 'present' or 'no'. And I will be glad to ask the Supreme Court to take up this particular question. Because most of us are going to be voting on something which we've absolutely no idea of what this means. Think about that."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Jones, for what reason do you rise?

In support or opposition?"

Jones: "In support."

Speaker Davis: "In support. Please proceed."

Jones: "Mr. Chairman, the last speaker made some comments that we need to unpack. So one of the comments he made that most people in this room won't understand what's going on, but you clearly enumerated six points that we discussed in committee thoroughly. But for legislative intent, could you, again, explain to the Body what we're doing and why this won't increase or stop the number of cases that will go before our judicial system?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he'll yield."

Thapedi: "I think... I think that's a very good question. First of all, let's talk about at what point in the litigation this

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

actually becomes an issue. This doesn't even become an issue in litigation until you're actually at trial. Which in these types of cases where you'll see special interrogatories used maybe three, four, five, six plus years. But it's important to note that the reason why cases take so long to get to that point where they're actually being tried is because the defense lawyers drag out the cases for so long. When the suit is first filed the defense lawyers will start bombarding the plaintiffs with motions to dismiss which can last years. Then the defense lawyers will start bombarding the plaintiffs with written discovery requests. Then the defense lawyers will start bombarding the plaintiffs with different requests for different depositions. Start deposing everyone all over the world. Then after they've done that then they'll start what are called motions for summary judgment, which then takes the case an additional year or so longer. So the way to resolve this, Representative Jones... and I appreciate the question... is if the defendants would properly evaluate claims at the beginning and if they're meritorious claims they should pay out the claim. But if they feel that they want to litigate until the cows come home that's their prerogative. But the person who really ends up being hurt is the injured party, whoever that plaintiff is. So the other suggestion that we should not be involved in this space dealing with special interrogatories is too late. The Bill actually proposed an absolute outright repeal of special interrogatories. That was the preference for some of the same reasons that you heard the minority... Minority Leader mention. We were proposing a repeal of the special interrogatories. And if the Supreme

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Court wanted to step in and actually implement rules on this particular issue, they were free to do so. However, the Defense Bar was completely opposed to a repeal. So what happened was, was that we took language from the Defense Bar and all of the defendants language that they thought would be... a little bit more palatable. And I think that if you look actually at your analyses you will see that several of those high-powered defendants, if you will, are now neutral on the Bill because of the efforts that we made to try to accommodate them. So I don't understand that line of questioning and quite frankly it's not accurate and it's not true."

Jones: "So, Representative, to that point let's... let's go through what happened in committee because it was mischaracterized that in committee we didn't allow the proponents... or the opponents of this Bill. You worked hard on this Bill. You... the Defense Bar came with language that they had it... they were at the table. You included some of that language in this Amendment. Speak to that. And to speak to what happened in committee today."

Thapedi: "No. And I appreciate that question as well. And I am a little shocked to hear the arguments coming from the GOP side of the aisle because I spent many years as a defense lawyer, as a medical malpractice defense lawyer. And I actually used special interrogatories. So I know the nature of what these instruments can actually do in the course of trial. But what we did in committee was is that we made sure that everyone had an opportunity to address the issues on this particular point. And after taking a lot of that input, especially from the Defense Bar, as I said before and I'm repeating myself,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

but I probably should, we incorporated some of their requests into the actual Bill which is the Amendment now. For an example, the permissive nature of... of the actual giving of a special interrogatories to the jury. And I think that the other point that we heard from this side of the aisle was not accurate. And there are cases that actually talk about that... that talking about that juries are not stupid, that juries are actually empowered and are... are taught and asked and requested when they come in to hear a case to not leave their common sense at the front door. They're to bring their common sense into the courtroom. The challenge becomes is when we have inconsistent verdicts that are inconsistent with what the jury was actually seeking to do."

Jones: "You know, it's kind of funny that we've asked that no one understands this Bill, but everyone on the other side is still talking about this important Bill while we're discussing this important Bill. It was specifically mentioned that the Illinois Trial Lawyers are the sole proponents of this Bill. But yet you mentioned not only the Illinois State Bar Association but you... you moved several people to neutral on this Bill. Please, for a minute go through those people that you've moved to neutral that are important that were strongly against this Bill. And, Mr. Speaker, I have one last question but I'd like the Representative to answer the first question."

Thapedi: "Okay. Not notwithstanding the sandbagging here on the floor, it was my understanding that the proponents of the Bill were the Illinois State Bar Association and the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association. It was my understanding that upon the Amendment to the Bill… again, taking it from an outright

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

repeal to the language that had been requested by the Defense Bar that that took the Illinois Insurance Association, the Illinois State Medical Society, the City of Chicago, and PACE all to neutral. The only opponents that I knew of, prior to getting sandbagged on the floor, were the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, contacted me this morning and said that they were in opposition. I wrote back and specifically asked them why are they in opposition. They did not respond. The... the Chicago Transit Authority is in opposition. I'm not a hundred percent sure why they're in opposition, because we already have a special provision in our law that allows the City of Chicago to avoid the statute of limitations like many other defendants. That the statute of limitations is generally two years but for the CTA it's one year. So again, I'm not sure how else to answer that question."

Jones: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Jones: "The Representative have worked... has worked hard on this Bill and moved strong opposition to neutral. This is a... an extremely important change to our criminal justice system or to our system. It allows not only the judge to have discretion, but it makes important changes. I strongly urge 'aye' vote. And ask that everyone please listen to the rest of this debate on this Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stava-Murray, we've had three speak in favor already. Are you speaking in opposition? Representative Thapedi to close."

Thapedi: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Speaker Davis: "On this question... 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2233?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Yingling. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 74 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Villanueva, for what reason do you rise?"
- Villanueva: "Mr. Speaker, can I let the record show that on HB2625 I am a 'yes'?"
- Speaker Davis: "The record shall so reflect. House Bill 3358, Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3358, a Bill for an Act concerning business. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Turner."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Turner on House Floor Amendment #3."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt the Amendment and just discuss it on Third Reading. It pretty much becomes the Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Turner moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3358 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

  Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3358, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. I'm here on House Bill 3358. And quite simply, 3358, as amended, creates the Data Transparency and Privacy Act. A comprehensive set of regulation regarding the collection and dissemination of consumer internet data. It allows a consumer to have the right to transparency over company data and sales policies. A right to know what information is being collected and who that information is being shared or sold to and also a right to opt out of having ones' information sold. That's quite simply what the Bill is. There is no private right of action included in this Bill. The Attorney General is the designated as the exclusive enforcement authority. We wrote that language exactly into the Bill. And we've also made a couple more changes on the... on the Amendment 3 to appease some of the opponents and bring many of the opponents to neutral on the Bill. It adds an exemption for the Act for telecommunication companies, clarifies that the definition of consumer does not include someone acting in an employment context, clarifies a few other definitions, narrows the definition of personal information, changes the requirement that a business must share the names of the entities and information to sharing the categories of the entities instead of the names and the number of entities in each category, removes the provision that the Attorney General to create rules for opting out, and adds clarifying language to the HIPPA exemption as well. We've worked really hard on this Bill. And while there are still a

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

little bit of opposition out there, we are going to continue to work hard on it in the Senate, should this Bill get out of here today. I'd appreciate the support of the Body."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wheeler, for what reason do you rise? A reminder this Bill is on Short Debate."

Wheeler: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Will the ... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Turner: "Absolutely.

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative Turner, you and I have talked on this Bill a few times. And I want us to just again like I... mentioned to one of our other colleagues, I appreciate the work you're doing on this, I understand where you're trying to go. And I also want to say I appreciate the fact that you've worked with so many different people who have reached out to you and say we have an issue with this and you've accommodated many of those. I do have a few things that aren't quite accommodated yet. I'd like to bring them into the record today while we discuss this. Is that all right?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Wheeler: "Number one, I do want to just reiterate for everybody on my side of the aisle who have may have missed in the opening statement that Representative Turner gave, there is no private right of action in this current language."

Turner: "Absolutely no private right of action. We worked hard to make sure that we had language that locked that down and made the Attorney General's Office the sole enforcement entity on

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

this piece. We included specific language in there, no private right of action."

Wheeler: "Thank you for that. Let me just real quickly, you had mentioned that you had made some changes and there's some exemptions as well. I want to just quickly go through my list of exemptions. There's a HIPPA exemption, there's a bank exemption, a state contractor exemption, a public utility exemption, hospital exemption, retailer exemption, clarified HIPPA exemption, Medicaid provider exemption and a telecom exemption. That's my brief versions of exemptions. Those are in the Bill, correct?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir. Those are in the Bill and a lot of that is to comply with federal regulations and other things like that.

We really tried to work with all of the interested parties on this."

Wheeler: "No, and... and again, I appreciate your efforts to do that. What I want to point to then is the private entity definition near the beginning of the Bill that defines... and if you achieve any of these three issues you are then subject to this Act. The first one is a gross revenue of \$25 million. The second one is a buy and sell personal information of 50 thousand consumers, households or devices. And the third one is derives 50 percent or more of the annual revenue from selling consumer personal information. I believe I have that right from the Bill."

Turner: "That's absolutely right."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Now the second two I can understand where this Bill really makes sense for, people who are accumulating and selling lots of personal information or they're pretty

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

much data brokers who their whole purpose is to sell information. So my question to you, Leader Turner, is that first definition. That gross revenue of \$25 million if... to me the Bill is trying to address people who are really in the act of buying and selling people's personal information."

Turner: "Correct."

"But that gross revenue of \$25 million that can reach Wheeler: down into a small business who sells commercial buildings or who does things along the lines that are just large scale projects with a low number of people that aren't heavily invested in tech. That... I would love to see a definition that is altered in that respect to pretty much address the people you're trying to work with on this Bill. At the same time leaving people out who are not really, I think, the people who this is intended for. So as this Bill moves forward, provided it does, today I would encourage you, if you would, to work on that. I'm happy to work with you on it. I know I have meetings scheduled with some other proponents to try and work on this because I believe that this is ... we're trying to get to a good Bill here. I can't support today's language but I want to help make this a better Bill. And you have my commitment."

Turner: "And I appreciate that, Representative. You bring up a good point. And there... there are three thresholds for being a private entity, the 25 million, the over 50 thousand people... people's worth information that you're collecting, and 50 percent revenue from selling data."

Wheeler: "Right."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Turner: "However, once you meet that threshold you still have to be an operator, which is a private entity that owns an internet website or online service and collects personal information for commercial purposes. The intent is not to encompass any company that just meets one of those thresholds, but we will continue to meet and discuss this with you. And we can work on this as the Bill moves over to the Senate."

Wheeler: "Well I appreciate it. Yeah, just to reiterate what you said, I agree. I think that if there's an 'and' instead of an 'or' on some of things I think that would make more sense. Just because then you're saying that companies of that scale who are doing this kind of work are really the ones that we're narrowly talking about in this Bill. Let me move on just for a moment here so we don't take the Body's time tonight all night long."

Turner: "No problem."

Wheeler: "I have question for you as we forward about the determining the location for the conduct of that place outside of the State of Illinois. Again, if this Bill does not effectively carve out some of the smaller entities I believe that are still effected by the Bill they would have to be... they would be effectively mandated to track where some of these... this takes place from. And I just like to see clarification of how that might work better so that a compliance issue doesn't occur as we go forward. Does that make sense?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir. If I can to that point. The majority of the time they can tell from a person's IP address. If for some reason the IP address are filtered then they usually... that

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

person would have to create an account to access and could input their location information through that process. Otherwise you could make sure that a firewall or whatever a company is using to filter the IP addresses collects the person's actual IP address as well. But I'm open to continuing our discussion around this issue and working with you and working with the Senate Sponsor to address that. We want to make a good Bill, Representative."

- Wheeler: "Thank you. And the last thing I want to ask you about, Representative, it has to do with the waiver section. It claims in there there's an agreement does not comply is void. This effectively takes the terms of service that you have an agreement with, with a provider and nullifies the entire terms of service as I read that. I have questions that we can, you know, try and sort through about what that leaves the situation. The agreement that has between the user and the actual company about what happens after the fact if that is somehow nullified. What rights does the actual user have? This is my biggest concern."
- Turner: "All right. But we don't want them burying in 30 pages of the terms of service or anything like that. So that's kind of the goal around that issue."
- Wheeler: "Yeah. No, I get... I get the idea. I'm just wondering if it nullifies the entire thing then that becomes an issue of what happens to my data that if I have an agreement with a company or..."
- Turner: "I... I can't hear you. I'm sorry, Representative."
- Wheeler: "I'm sorry. If I have data stored in that company and they... they violate some element of this Act, my whole term of

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

service with that company is null and void based on how I read this language. And I'm concerned what happens to the relationship between the company and the user if that happens. I'd like to see a little clarity about that."

Turner: "We may be seeing it different, Representative. But again, that's something that we can work on."

Wheeler: "Yeah, I know. Again, I just want to put this on the record for as we understand there are still questions out there, they're legitimate questions I believe. But I really appreciate your efforts to get in the right direction on this. And I look forward to working with you some more. So thank you."

Turner: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Demmer, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we place this Bill on the Order of Standard Debate?"

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate."

Demmer: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Demmer: "Thank you. Leader Turner, I appreciate the fact that over the last couple years we've worked on several data privacy Bills. I know there's been a lot of discussion over these Bills. I just want to ask a couple of things. You know, my colleague Representative Wheeler is really an expert in these and he brought up several concerns that I think many people have about how some of the definitions are crafted and how this Bill is crafted today. What I want to ask is, are

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

there specific industries or types of providers that are exempted in the Bill today?"

Turner: "There's an exemption for telecommunication companies."

Demmer: "How about for utility companies?"

Turner: "I don't believe so, Representative."

Demmer: "You don't believe there is an exemption for utility companies?"

Turner: "I don't think so."

Demmer: "Okay. How about for retail... retail providers?"

Turner: "So for retailers who operate pursuant to Federal Law there is an exemption."

Demmer: "Okay. So for a certain..."

Turner: "Like SNAP benefits and things like that."

Demmer: "Okay. I appreciate that. And how about for medical providers or people who are subject to HIPPA?"

Turner: "HIPPA."

Demmer: "Okay. There's an exemption for that as well? I... thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think it's just important that we note that..."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Demmer: "...as we work through a complicated issue like this and an industry expresses concern over how it would be implemented. And an industry expresses concern over what the definitions are, what maybe some of the unintended consequences might be. There are a couple of ways we could deal with those concerns. One way of dealing with those concerns would be to address the underlying problem and to say, we need to correct this definition, we need to correct this provision about how this will be enforced or implemented, we need to clarify that we're

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

talking about issue A and not issue B. There's ways that we could craft a Bill that would alleviate many of those concerns. Another way of addressing those concerns is to simply issue exemptions. And I fear that's what we've done with this Bill to an extent, is when an interest group has expressed a concern with us we've said okay, we realize there are concerns here, we're not going to change the underlying language, instead we're going to just issue an exemption from this. I would encourage the Body to be cognizant of that as we proceed through this that we really need to correct the core of the problem, to try to get a better definition. Again, as Representative Wheeler has talked about, get better definitions for what we're going at here, have a better understanding in the language of the Bill and not just in what floor debate is. So we get to the core of what we're trying to protect with data and not cause unintended consequences or have definitions that are left up to the interpretation of many different parties who could be present during litigation. Let's try to correct the definitions of these Bills as we go forward and not simply say, this group is concerned about it so we'll exempt them, hope to take them off as opponents of the Bill and move forward until we have proponents who... who are not strong enough to get exemptions for themselves. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Turner to close."

Turner: "Thank you. I'd just say to that point that a lot of the exemptions were made had some... some of them had federal issues. And in full transparency we did exempt utilities on this piece because they have their own consumer privacy law

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- piece that they follow. We've worked really hard on this guys. I'd as for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3358 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
  And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Buckner,
  Grant, Halpin, Jones, Rita. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 72 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3196,
  Representative Villanueva. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3196, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, is offered by Representative Villanueva."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Villanueva on House Floor Amendment #1."
- Villanueva: "So House Floor Amendment 1 just adds a few more state agencies like the Department of Employment Security, the Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education and ICCB to the task force. And it also includes a couple more goals and findings that we'd wish to complete through this task force, including basically practices and procedures of Immigration, Customs Enforcement federal agency and also their interaction with state agencies and the conditions of detention centers in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Villanueva moves for... for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

the 'yeses' have it. And the House Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3196, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Villanueva."

Villanueva: "So House Bill 3196 essentially creates the Immigration Task Force Act to examine issues related to immigrant communities in the State of Illinois. The task force includes 24 appointed representatives by Legislative Leaders, the Governor's Office, various state agencies and organizations that offer aid and services to immigrant communities. The task force is to report its findings to the Governor and the General Assembly on or before May 31 of 2020. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Batinick: "Opposition-ish."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Batinick: "Representative, is this a new task force or changing a task force?"

Villanueva: "This is a new task force. Yes."

Batinick: "And what is the breakdown of the appointments for the 24 members?"

Villanueva: "So... you want me to read all 24?"

Batinick: "Please."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Villanueva: "Okay. So we have one Member that's appointed by the President of the Senate, one by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one by the Minority Leader, one by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, a representative from the Governor's Office, a representative from the Governor's Office of Management and Budget, a representative from the Lieutenant Governor's Office, a representative of the Executive Director of the Illinois Housing Department Authority, a representative of the Secretary of Human Services, a representative of the Director of the Department on Aging, a representative from the Director of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, a representative..."
- Batinick: "Can I... so it sounds like it's a lot of directors from the Executive Branch. So the General Assembly sends four, each Leader, and then the Governor's Office appoints somebody and then after that it's directors, correct?"
- Villanueva: "Yes. Well there's actually five positions for organizations that are immigrant serving organizations on the task force as well."
- Batinick: "So those organizations... what are the names of those organizations?"
- Villanueva: "Those have not been outlined, those are conversations that we're going to have with all of these individuals."
- Batinick: "Okay. And are these task force members non compensated?"

Villanueva: "Not compensated."

Batinick: "Okay. I understand what that means."

Villanueva: "Trying to make it easy for you, Representative."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Batinick: "No... no. Yeah, thank you. And what is the goal of the task force?"

Villanueva: "The task force is basically to examine the issues, like I said before, relating to immigrant communities. So in the past 10 years we've worked on... in this General Assembly in sometimes a bipartisan fashion... worked on issues and legislation that would be helpful to immigrant communities in the State of Illinois. And so, what I want to do and work on is to basically see are those laws actually helping to benefit immigrant communities, are they opening up businesses, are we doing as much as we can possible to actually help integrate immigrant communities into the State of Illinois?"

Batinick: "Okay. Thank you for the answers to my questions."

Villanueva: "You're welcome."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Villanueva to close."

Villanueva: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3196 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Batinick, Brady, Carroll, Connor, Keicher, Mazzochi, Welter. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 76 voting 'yes', and 31 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3222, Representative Walker. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3222, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time previously. Amendment

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Carroll, do you wish to speak before we call the Bill on Third?"
- Carroll: "Yeah. Do you mind? I just want to say I was meant to be a 'yes' on 3196. Please let the record show. Thank you"
- Speaker Davis: "The record shall reflect. Mr. Clerk, Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3222, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Walker."
- Walker: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3222 is about a 30 acre parcel of land adjacent to the Chicago-Read Mental Health Center. This 30 acre parcel of wetlands and woodlands has been maintained by a volunteer group called Friends of the Park, even though the current easement is to DNR. The intent of 3222 is to allow DHS to instead convey the assessment... the easement to the Chicago Park District, who in turn would collaborate with Friends of the Park to maintain the parcel."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3222 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chesney. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2491, Representative Walsh. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2491, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in... in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Walsh."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh on House Floor Amendment #2."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 removes the opposition from the… the Illinois Environmental Council. And what the… the Amendment does is creates a pilot project within Will and Grundy Counties for the pyrolysis or gasification process. I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And House Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Walsh."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh on House Floor Amendment #3."
- Walsh: "Floor Amendment #3 is a technical change to ensure that the plastic acidification facility receives only uncontaminated plastics that have been processed prior to receipt at the facility. And I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

'yeses' have it. And House Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2491, a Bill for an Act concerning

safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Walsh."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2491, as amended, would create a pilot project dealing with a pyrolysis or gasification process for recycling unrecyclable plastics right now that contain styrene. This is a Bill that I've been working on now for about three years. It's an initiative of the Chemical Industry Council. But basically what this does is keep the lids of your coffee cup or the liners inside the refrigerators from going to a landfill. And this process would melt that down... that product down to its basic chemical form and then recomprise it either into a low sulfur diesel fuel and/or into raw styrene stocked to be reproduced. It keeps this stuff out of the landfills. It takes hundreds and hundreds of years to decompose. Currently there are two facilities up and running. One in Akron, Ohio and one in Portland, Oregon. Indiana just ... a facility is being built in Ashley, Indiana that will convert about a hundred thousand tons of this plastic into ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel for BP and Whiting. And Florida, Wisconsin, Georgia, Iowa, and Tennessee have all passed this Bill with overwhelming majorities. In fact, Iowa just last month passed it with the support of the Sierra Club. So basically within my corridor of I-55 I have two styrene facilities right by

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

the Des Plaines River with ExxonMobil Refinery right next to it, with the transportation and rail needs, and waterway access. It's a perfect fit to start this process. I'd be happy... happy to answer any questions. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wehrli, this Bill is on Short Debate."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "Sponsor will. Are you speaking in opposition?"

Wehrli: "Maybe support. I'm not sure yet."

Speaker Davis: "Ish right?"

Wehrli: "I just... I just want to make sure that all opposition with the Amendment..."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Wehrli: "So the Amendment removes all opposition?"

Walsh: "From... from my understanding, with this Amendment #2 the Environmental Council and Sierra Club went neutral on the Bill."

Wehrli: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2491 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Costa Howard, Keicher, Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 106 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

40th Legislative Day

- Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2576, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2576, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. This Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Zalewski on House Floor Amendment #2."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #2 creates a pilot program that accomplishes the spirit of the Bill for 1500 youth deer permits in Illinois. I ask for its adoption and move the Bill to Third Reading."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Zalewski moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the House Floor Amendment #2 is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2576, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2576 was brought to me by a constituent, a young man named Will. He thought there should be a program for youth to hunt with deer hunting permits for statewide. It was a good civics lesson. We... we ushered the Bill down through the Legislature. The Bill came before the Ag Committee. And I think it's a good Bill. I think

40th Legislative Day

- he had a really good idea. The DNR, we're going to continue to work with them on it. But I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2576 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gordon-Booth. Sommer. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3084, Representative Lilly. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3084, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Lilly."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Lilly on House Floor Amendment #1."
- Lilly: "House Bill #1 is an agreed Amendment with the Department of Commerce to ensure that we are working together in a pilot format towards making sure members of the community have access to services and resources through Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Lilly moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

  Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3084, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you. We are creating Citizen Service Coordinators through the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity in order to make sure that citizens have access to services provided by the division. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3084 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davidsmeyer, Evans, Hernandez, Smith, Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3711, Representative Ramirez. Representative Ramirez. Out of the record. House Bill 3068, Representative Costa Howard. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3068, a Bill for an Act concerning health. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Costa Howard."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Costa Howard on Floor Amendment #1."
- Costa Howard: "Thank you. One moment. I'm so sorry, Mr. Speaker.

  We'd like to move... Amendment, we'd like to move to Third

  Reading. Please, I apologize. We'd like to adopt Floor

40th Legislative Day

- Amendment #1. And it was a... it is a task force that will be working with Solid Waste Management."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Costa Howard moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And House Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Costa Howard."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Costa Howard on Floor Amendment #2."
- Costa Howard: "Yes. It is a technical Amendment that went through committee today and passed."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Costa Howard moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'... say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Floor Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3068, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Costa Howard."
- Costa Howard: "Thank you. This is a... House Bill 3068 establishes...
  excuse me... is a gut and replace Amendment to the Bill which
  creates a Statewide Materials Management Advisory Committee.
  The committee is tasked with investigating and providing
  recommendations for expanding waste reduction, reduce-reuserecycle, and composting in Illinois in a manner that protects
  the environment. There is no compensation to this advisory

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

committee that will be doing these reports. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Batinick: "I rise for the opposition that might switch, Mr. Speaker, if that's okay?"

Speaker Davis: "The opposition and?"

Batinick: "The opposition that... I might be a proponent after I ask my questions."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition-ish."

Batinick: "I'm rising in opposition to keep it on Short Debate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Representative, thank you for explaining on Third Reading a little bit more deeply. Couple things we were originally 16-11 in committee. It looked like the two recommend be adopted of the Floor Amendments you were unanimous in committee, correct?"

Costa Howard: "Yes."

Batinick: "And then this isn't... you mentioned in the adoption of the Amendment you said task force, but then in the description of the Bill you mentioned advisory committee. Can you explain what the difference is between the..."

Costa Howard: "I... I apologize it isn't... we have an advisory committee that is going to be working on setting up this report and bringing this information forward."

Batinick: "Do you... what's the difference for our Members on our side between a task force and an advisory committee?"

40th Legislative Day

- Costa Howard: "One sec I... I apologize, Representative... one second."
- Batinick: "Take your time."
- Costa Howard: "I apologize. I misspoke. We... it is a... it is a group that will be... it's the Statewide Materials Committee, so it is not a task force. I apologize, Representative. And that Advisory Committee will be investigating reduce-reuse-recycle, our solid waste management here in the State of Illinois. And they will be producing reports to give us locations where those materials can be recycled."
- Batinick: "Okay. Thank you. And my... my understanding is advisory committee is kind of permanent task force has an end date with a goal. So you're setting up a permanent committee that's noncompensated."
- Costa Howard: "Absolutely not. Actually the sunset, which was the second Amendment today that was passed in committee. The report may also include a list of nonpermitted facilities but the section is repealed and it will sunset in 2022."
- Batinick: "Okay. Thanks for the clarification. I appreciate it."

  Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Costa

  Howard to close."
- Costa Howard: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3068 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
  And the vote is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davidsmeyer, Keicher, Murphy, Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 104 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3711, Representative Ramirez. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3711, a Bill for an Act concerning health. The Bill was read for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Ramirez."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ramirez on House Floor Amendment #1."

Ramirez: "Speaker... Speaker, House Floor Amendment #1 is an Amendment with just some technical changes to address some issues that opposition had. By adopting this Amendment we remove all opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ramirez will move... excuse me, moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And House Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3711, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative..."

Ramirez: "Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ramirez, I'm sorry."

Ramirez: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 3711 is an important measure that will help us modernize our state's policies and make sure that public restrooms are friendlier to families. House Bill 3711 will require that restrooms are open to the public and a public building shall be equipped with baby

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

changing stations that are safe, sanitary, and usable for mothers and fathers. The House Floor Amendment 1 addressed some of the issues that we had making sure that we indicated such language as, if there is already family restroom, an all gendered restroom available... in a facility that we would not have to require additional baby changing stations. There were also some other exemptions including that if in fact there's an industrial building, or nightclub, or a bar that does not permit anyone who's under 18 years of age to enter the premises, or a restroom located in a health facility. If the restroom is intended for just one patient or if there is a renovation of a local building permitting entity or building inspector that determines that by including a baby changing station we would in some way create a violation of ADA. That those three areas and those three categories that a baby changing station for both mothers and fathers not be required. If you talk to new parents they will tell you over and over just the challenges they have both mothers and fathers in doing the basic thing like changing their children when they're out in a restaurant or in a public facility. Since I introduced this Bill I've had endless calls and testimonies congratulating me on finally being able to bring forth a Bill that addresses the issues of mothers and fathers when they're in public facilities. It is for that reason that I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 3711."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Murphy, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Murphy: "I would like just some legislative clarification."

Speaker Davis: "Are you in opposition or?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Murphy: "Opposition but I probably will... you know, interested in changing."
- Speaker Davis: "Opposition-ish according to Representative Batinick. Please proceed."
- Murphy: "Representative, I just have a couple of questions in regards to this. I just want to make sure."
- Speaker Davis: "She indicates she'll yield. Please proceed."

Ramirez: "I've yielded."

Murphy: "Yes. Thank you. Representative, I just have a couple of questions. I want to make sure. Now this only applies to new restaurants or restaurants who request a building permit that has more than 50 percent remodeling. Is that correct?"

Ramirez: "That is correct."

Murphy: "Okay. And there's no intent of changing those standards when it goes to the Senate?"

Ramirez: "That is my understanding. That is correct."

Murphy: "Okay. Thank you very much. That's the only questions I had."

- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Ramirez to close."
- Ramirez: "I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 3711. Making sure that mothers and fathers are able to do that one thing, change their children when they're out in public facilities. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3711 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
  And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Butler, Grant,
  McCombie, Parkhurst, Sommer. Mr. Clerk, please take the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

record. On this question, 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1115, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1115, the Bill was read for a third time previously, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Ammons."

Ammons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1115 was ran earlier. We had a couple Members that we missed today that wanted to vote 'yes' for this Bill to assist us in moving forward on this piece of legislation. We will continue to work on this Bill in the Senate so that we can try to address some of the concerns as I demonstrated earlier with the PRB. We will continue to work on this Bill. I thank those 58 Members who voted 'yes' before. And I ask them to vote 'yes' again. And our additional 2 Members so we can continue to work on this Bill. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Batinick: "Mr. Speaker, I'll be extremely short. I just want to remind my side of the aisle that they voted on this Bill already. So we're not going to go ahead and debate it again. Just remember how you voted previously. Thank you."

Ammons: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, and the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1115 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Demmer, Didech, Edly-Allen, Rita, Robinson, Severin.

40th Legislative Day

- Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 62 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Severin is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Davis: "The record shall so reflect. House Bill 3584,

  Representative Butler... Buckner, excuse me. Representative

  Buckner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3584, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Buckner."
- Buckner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. HB3584 amends the Rights of Crime Victims and Witnesses Act to make changes to the law concerning crime victims' participation in the Prison Review Board hearings. Specifically, it provides that a victim impact statement received by the Prisoner Review Board shall be confidential and privileged. It provides that a written report of the board's recommendations to the Governor regarding clemency shall be confidential and privileged. And it establishes that a crime victim has the right to register with the Prison Review Board's victim registry and to submit a victim impact statement to the board for consideration at hearings or at an executive clemency hearing. I urge a 'yea' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3584 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the vote is open. Have all voted

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Skillicorn. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 456, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 456, a Bill for an Act concerning safety.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This has no opposition and the EPA is okay with is as well as the Environmental Council. This would provide an exception to industrial facilities that would burn and recycle material for fuel derived therefrom that is licensed on the United States Environmental Protection Agency."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no debate, and the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 837?' Excuse me, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 456?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 837, Representative Kifowit. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 837, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Kifowit."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 837 is initiative of the 84th Youth Advisory Council. And what it does is it creates a Youth Advisory Council for the State of Illinois."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Bourne, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Bourne: "I'm opposed."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Bourne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, I just have a few questions.

Number one, how many members are on this advisory council and how is it made up?"

Kifowit: "This advisory council was presented by my students in my district. It is made up for pretty much one representative from each Senate District. And we corrected it so that it... they would be recommended by the Representatives and then recommended by the Senators. So it would be a collaboration because my youth advisory council wants to be involved in their civic responsibility and influence of legislation."

Bourne: "So how many members are on your advisory council?"

Kifowit: "The same number of Senators, which would be 59."

Bourne: "Okay. Thank you. Do you know how many youth advisory councils or student advisory councils already exist in agencies for State Government?"

Kifowit: "I know that there are a few. I just talked to ISBE, as a matter of fact, today. Those youth advisory councils, such as the one with ISBE, focuses only on educational issues and there are other ones that focus only on specific issues. There is no youth advisory council that focuses on the legislative

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

process, that embraces civics, that embraces lawmaking and actually works with... with the Legislative Body. So this would be the only one that actually does that."

Bourne: "And who would be staffing this advisory council?"

Kifowit: "We put that into the Executive Branch. And according to the fiscal note that was filed it would be of no impact... no fiscal impact."

Bourne: "Well, that was no fiscal impact for... it would be minimal fiscal impact for the travel expenses, et cetera. But do you know how many people it would take to staff this advisory council?"

Kifowit: "The... the residents, the students are very tech savvy and for the most part... based on the fiscal note and for the most part it would be done technologically and remotely."

Bourne: "Okay. And have you spoken with any of the advisory... youth advisory or student advisory council... the folks who facilitate those, do you think that this will be duplicative of any work that's already on going?"

Kifowit: "Just to repeat myself, I did talk to ISBE and there... and I am acknowledgeable of other youth advisory councils that have, again, not to repeat myself, but they have specific tasks and specific viewpoints such as education with ISBE. They are specifically defined. What this would do is to interact and actually engage in civics and engage in lawmaking. And again, not to repeat myself, but would actually want to influence the legislative process."

Bourne: "To the ... to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bourne: "We already have at least five youth or student advisory councils in State Government currently. Just in one that I've spoken to at ISBE that has 20 members it requires seven support staff to facilitate it. I don't dispute that this is a good thing. To have young people involved in State Government, to bring them into the process. Many of us already choose to do this through having our own youth advisory councils, millennial advisory groups. I mean there are a variety of ways to get young people engaged in this process. I'm concerned that this is duplicative with many of the processes we already have. I'm concerned with how we're going to facilitate this. I don't dispute that it's a good thing to get young people involved. I'm concerned with the implementation of this Bill. And for that reason I have to suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Skillicorn, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Skillicorn: "Potentially... both ways, opposed but I could support it."

Speaker Davis: "It's on Short Debate. So we've already had one in favor and one opposed."

Skillicorn: "Can we go to Standard Debate then?"

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate."

Skillicorn: "Thank you so much. Will the Representative yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She indicates she will."

Skillicorn: "So I love when people... the youth get involved that's a good thing. This I want to hang around a couple details, some of it the previous Representative kind of touched on. Is it the Executive Branch that will organize this and spend the

40th Legislative Day

- staff time making sure these meetings happen, things like that?"
- Kifowit: "Right. We... we I... I have not heard any opposition from the Executive Branch, which would be the Governor, or an agency that he designates would be better. The legislation just calls for one annual meeting for elections that doesn't even have to be overnight, it can certainly be done during the day. And then the rest is going to be administered electronically, Skype and those sort of things."
- Skillicorn: "So there is a... a annual meeting... because the technology part of it, if it's on Skype, you know, probably no problem there. But there is an annual meeting for..."
- Kifowit: "For elections."
- Skillicorn: "Its 59 students right that have to attend this once a year?"
- Kifowit: "Well as... as meetings those students that attend will vote. I mean they're members and members we hope would show up. But all they need is a meeting place. And they will take elections so that there's structure and then that would be it."
- Skillicorn: "Is... is the intent that they'll meet like a state property or something? Or is it, you know, a hotel room, a conference room, or something like that?"
- Kifowit: "It's their intent to decide where to meet when they want to. I mean it's... it's how they decide to meet. It's a youth council. It's empowering our youth for this. So it would... they would decide where the best place to meet could be. It could be the... at a library. It could be at a place

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

other than Springfield. It's a youth council embracing and empowering our youth."

Skillicorn: "Well the only... my only reason I ask that question it'd be nice if we as Legislators have legislative intent. If all of a sudden it says they can do it at a conference hall or something and rent it out and there's expense to that. It seems like we're opening, you know, a box. There's a lot stuff going on, it's a big state, you know, we have kids going all over the state you know traveling somewhere. I just wonder it seems like a big lift for a state that has a hard time just getting a budget passed."

Kifowit: "Well it... the Governor's Office would help coordinate.

It's really a youth advisory council and a youth initiative.

So I don't see why the youth would want to spend money to rent out a hall if... if we have space at a state building or at a library that has enough space that could be rented for free."

Skillicorn: "So I would love the suggestion..."

Kifowit: "So I think the legislative intent is to empower the students to run a youth advisory council for the state and the Governor's Office would be minimal or will just provide assistance if needed or requested by the students."

Skillicorn: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I would..."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Skillicorn: "...I'm gonna advocate a 'yes' vote on this. But I would hope that hearing this debate, seeing the transcript these youth say, why don't we hold it at a state facility, how about even the General Assembly here? That would be fine. It does

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

seem like we're opening a big thing but let's go ahead and pass some feel good something today."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"

Butler: "Question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Davis: "Are you in support or opposition?"

Butler: "Opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition. Please proceed."
Butler: "Thank you, Sir. Just to follow up..."
Speaker Davis: "She indicates she'll yield."

Butler: "Just to follow up on Representative Bourne's comments, a couple things. I just want to be clear 'cause I was trying to read through the Bill here and you... so you said it's by Senate District, but I looked on here and it looked like I could see where it was from Representative District. I just want to make sure. Did that change in the Bill in the Amendment or something from the original version?"

Kifowit: "No, the intent is to have the Representatives and the Senate work together, so the Representatives could select individuals from their Representative District, work with their Senator, and then have one per Senate District."

Butler: "So my great staff here tells me in the Floor Amendment there's one per Representative District. Is that correct?

Each Member of the House of Representatives shall nominate one qualified individual that resides in their Representative's Legislative District?"

Kifowit: "Shall nominate them with a Senator. But there's going to... but the council is 59. So if there's a drafting error we

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

can certainly correct it. So the Representatives are supposed to..."

Butler: "Here... here hold on."

Kifowit: "If there's a drafting error we can correct it."

Butler: "So each... each Member of the House of Representatives shall nominate one qualified individual that resides in the Representative's Legislative District to serve as a member of the council."

Kifowit: "Again, I said, if there's a drafting error then we can correct it. The youth advisory council is 59 individuals. So it is supposed to have been drafted... and my apologies... to say that they would nominate them to the Senator and the Senator would have one. So we can certainly change that in the Senate. It's not a big issue."

Butler: "So the other question I have in Section 40, if I'm reading this correctly, again, to Representative Bourne's point about staff support. It says staff and administrative support for the council shall be provided by the Office of the Governor or an agency designated by the Governor that is under the jurisdiction of the Governor. And this is really important here, staff members shall be uncompensated. So does that... it doesn't say their work for the commission or the council will be uncompensated. It just flat out says, staff members shall be uncompensated. So somebody who's working in the Governor's Office is working for free because they won't be... because they have to be uncompensated under this Bill?"

Kifowit: "So what that means... and again if you need it clarified we can clarify it in the Senate... that's normal language to

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

means that they won't get additional compensation. They're working within the auspice of their own salaried position."

Butler: "Well, I've done... I've done some Bills about this."

Kifowit: "Again, if you want that tweaked we can tweak it in the Senate. It's normal language so that they're not getting additional compensation above and beyond their salary."

Butler: "To the to the Bill. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Butler: "I don't have a vote in the Senate. I have a vote in the House and these are Bills that are voted on in the House. And so that's why when we get them out of the House we like to take care of things here. I've done a few of these commissions before. And I've had different language when it comes to the noncompensation of staff that works on this. This flat out says, staff members shall be uncompensated on the staff from the Governor's Office. It's... it's as straight forward as that. I think that there's a lot of issues with this legislation that's been pointed out so far. I would prefer that we work that out in the House and not in the Senate. So I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Kifowit to close."

Kifowit: "Thank you, Chairman, Members of the House and committee. What was mentioned with regard to the compensation is... is technical. I am told that this is standard language of the other councils that are in it. So it's not absurd. And also we do have a provision in here that the council is... can accept donations as well. So if there are costs that need to be incurred there is a fund that's established to accept

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

donations. In addition to that, there are individuals that are nominated and they can be nominated by the Representatives it doesn't means that they're going to be chosen to sit on the council. The council is 59 members. It's an initiative of the residents. It's an initiative of the children. They want to be involved in the legislative process. And I ask for your support."

- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 837 pass?' All favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Frese, Grant, Hammond, Hernandez, Barbara, McCombie, Sommer, Grant. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 84 Members voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 423, Representative Scherer. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 423, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3 and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Scherer."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Scherer on Floor Amendment #3."
- Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to remove Floor Amendment 3 and adopt Floor Amendment 5, please."
- Speaker Davis: "Mr. Clerk, remove Floor Amendment #3. Mr. Clerk, Floor Amendment #5."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Scherer."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "Representative Scherer, Floor Amendment #5."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So House Bill 423, Floor Amendment 5... after a great deal of compromise from all of the interested parties, this Bill eliminates the basic skills test for students in college before student teaching. It sunsets in 2025 and it requires ISBE to thoroughly examine the content test. After that they may decide to do something with the content test. I know of no opposition. And I'd be happy to have this passed."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Scherer moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #5. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And Floor Amendment #5 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 423, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, House Floor Amendment 5 is what I already described about eliminating basic skills.

And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Bourne, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Bourne: "First could we move this to Standard Debate?"

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate."

Bourne: "Thank you. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "She does. Are you speaking in favor or opposition?'

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bourne: "Opposition, please."

Speaker Davis: "Opposition. Please proceed."

Bourne: "Thank you. Representative, with Floor Amendment 5 does it include the edTPA test or does that exclude? So we are just..."

Scherer: "There's nothing included about edTPA."

Bourne: "Okay. So we are just talking about basic skills test?"

Scherer: "Yes. And then that they must study the content test...

ISBE must study the content test."

Bourne: "Okay. So they're reviewing it but it's still required with this Bill?"

Scherer: "Correct."

Bourne: "Is this similar to the language that Representative Parkhurst had in her Bill?"

Scherer: "It is similar but there are some different nuances. She didn't have the part about studying the content test. And I have a sunset."

Bourne: "Okay. Could you... any other differences between her language and yours?"

Scherer: "Those are the only two I know of."

Bourne: "Okay. Thank you."

Scherer: "She's a chief-co on mine and I'm a chief-co on hers."

Bourne: "Okay. And you said you're not aware of any opposition.

Is that... I mean we have that there's a large group that was opposed originally. They've all moved to neutral with this Amendment?"

Scherer: "Actually the most recent list I have is 13 proponents including like all the unions, all the universities, and so on and five with no position, including ISBE."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bourne: "Okav."

Scherer: "There are no opponents."

Bourne: "Okay. Thank you. For those of you who've been following this conversation about the testing, I still think it's important to have standards and I think that studying this further could be helpful. I appreciate the Sponsor's work in getting so many of these opponents to neutral and amending her Bill. But I still will be a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Willis, for what reason do you rise?"

Willis: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Davis: "Speaking in favor or opposition?"

Willis: "In favor."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed. And she will yield."

Willis: "Thank you. Representative, this is not taking away all tests to become teachers. Is that correct?"

Scherer: "Correct."

Willis: "So it simply takes away the basic skills and at this point is a temporary, right? So it's only until 2025?"

Scherer: "Correct."

Willis: "And is there not some talk of overhauling that... the basic skills anyways?"

Scherer: "Yes."

Willis: "Okay. So... so what we're doing is we're taking a type of testing mechanism that many places already feels has some flaws in it or doesn't really have a real relevance as to whether you are actually a qualified teacher or not. Taking it off of the list and concentrating on things that truly make you a better teacher. For example, your student teaching

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

experience... all of that the content area tests. Those are the ones that we're still looking at, correct?"

Scherer: "Correct."

Willis: "Okay. So to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Willis: "This is something I know that the Sponsor has done a wonderful job. She has worked with other Sponsors on similar Bills. We at one point had every test that you could take for teacher off... off the table and that's not the way we wanted to go. This is a great compromise, taking the one that I think most people thought was not in the best intent for our perspective teachers and making it go forward. So I would urge the Body to vote 'aye' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Scherer to close."

Scherer: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to close with this, we are at a crisis level in the teacher shortage. It's affecting basically every region in every area across the state, which some people are unaware of. Many classrooms are sitting there without a qualified teacher. I know of a school district that right now has 50 open classrooms without a qualified teacher. We went from 2012 with nine thousand new licensees to in 2017 only three thousand, a sixty-six percent decline. Two thousand vacant teaching positions on the Illinois Education Job Bank. The ROE is recommending people to go out of state to get a license and come back in with reciprocity. This is all the most important thing that we can vote on today. And we have to put qualified, top notch, certified, licensed teachers in front of your child's

40th Legislative Day

- classroom rather than substitutes who keep changing every other week. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 423 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Caulkins, Frese, Sosnowski, Windhorst. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 85 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"
- Butler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the Journal reflect that Representative Sommer is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Davis: "The Journal shall so reflect. House Bill 94, Representative Slaughter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 94, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a third time previously."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter."
- Slaughter: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Good evening, I'm back once again with House Bill 94. If you recall this is regarding individuals that have gone into the Illinois Department of Corrections prior to our 1998 Truth-In-Sentencing policies. This Bill allows them to become eligible for sentence credits. In regards to that, these are individuals that have completed rehabilitative programs and services in treatment inside them inside the facility. This does not pertain to those that went into the department under the Truth-In-Sentencing era. This

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

does not pertain to sex offenders. And, yes, I am continuing to work with the Prisoners' Review Board, Illinois Department of Corrections, and also the State's Attorneys Association. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Batinick: "We're going to keep it on Short Debate as I am opposed."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "Representative, I know you're running this Bill again.

I'd like to just remind my side of the aisle that this is the Bill that I believe many of us had voted against. And you're going to run it again. I know we don't... on our side we don't like the deal of fixing it in the Senate. But my understanding is, is that you've agreed not to move this in the Senate as much as you can 'cause you're a Rep, but unless you have a hard commitment that all agencies are okay with this Bill, right?"

Slaughter: "That's correct. There's a hard commitment in the Senate to not move until we get the agreement from those entities, the Prisoner Review Board, Department of Corrections, and the State's Attorney Association."

Batinick: "Okay. I'm just going to urge my side, once again, to be extremely cautious with this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Slaughter to close."

Slaughter: "I humbly and respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 94 pass?'
All of those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Conroy, Costa Howard, D'Amico, DeLuca, Keicher, Wehrli. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2569, Representative Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2569, a Bill for an Act concerning polygraphs. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2569, a Bill for an Act concerning polygraphs. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stava-Murray."

Stava-Murray: "Thank you. So HB2569 is a very simple Bill that fixes a loophole that currently exists for the Illinois State Police and other police agencies and state agencies that use polygraph exams in their hiring processes. So currently when the... when police are hired everyone has to be hired in the exact same way. And so, when it gets to the polygraph everyone's taking the same test, the same questions. There was a point at which there's an annual conference on polygraph examiners where they spitball new ideas for questions. And sometimes these questions can come into our state where we have very specific laws in place to protect the process. So we, for example, say that the topics on the lie detector test cannot include religious beliefs, opinions regarding racial issues, political opinions, opinions about labor unions, or

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

sexual activities or preferences. So this a unique law to Illinois. And since the process is typically that... that national questions can be adopted into this question, what we found is that sometimes... so these national questions are in violation of our State Law. So this very simple Bill just says that on independent law... someone... an independent lawyer must review these questions and make sure that they comply with the State Law. And the rank and file Chicago FOP are neutral on this Bill. It passed out of committee on a partisan basis. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wheeler, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Wheeler: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Davis: "In opposition or?"

Wheeler: "Opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed. And she will yield."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative, I'm looking back on our analysis here and it shows here that this is opposed by the IML. And the reason is that it would be possibly... could be impossible to comply with this Bill. Did you give that any kind of answer to them as to what..."

Stava-Murray: "It could be what?"

Wheeler: "Impossible to comply with this Bill."

Stava-Murray: "In... in what way would it be impossible?"

Wheeler: "I'm actually asking you that question."

Stava-Murray: "So this is a very easy to comply with Bill.

Anywhere that's hiring police officers has a legal staff on retainer. We had a legal staff for our board of fire and police. The issue was actually that the company was taking

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

these questions directly from a national conference and putting them into the state. It was the same polygraph exam that was used by the State Police. There's actually very little difference in my understanding from the polygraph exams that are used different... in different places. So this would actually be, from what I have seen and heard, pretty easy to comply with."

Wheeler: "Let me give you an example the way that we're interpreting this right now. At least it's being interpreted... or could be interpreted. If the... the screening process can't begin until the questions have been approved by a third party. Is that every single time a polygraph has to occur?"

Stava-Murray: "No, it's every single time that the questions are changed. So the questions must be reviewed..."

Wheeler: "Hold on a second. I..."

Stava-Murray: "...by an independent legal counsel."

Wheeler: "I'm no polygraph expert but don't you ask questions based on the scenario and tailored to the person who's actually being questioned?"

Stava-Murray: "In terms of the... in terms of the individual questions?"

Wheeler: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you?"

Stava-Murray: "So in what example are you using there?"

Wheeler: "Well you're giving... you're telling me these questions become uniform, they can never be changed, but I'm at least imagining a situation where if the person is being questioned they may not be getting the same exact questions every single time as the last person that has gotten the questions."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Stava-Murray: "Are you talking about the application for the hiring process or a different application?"

Wheeler: "Right. So the situation has to be the same every time they use those exact same questions? Or is this some..."

Stava-Murray: "Yeah, it's legally you have to."

Wheeler: "Just the baseline part of it."

Stava-Murray: "I mean if you were to not ask the exact questions every time you would be not in compliance with the way that you need to do police hiring, correct."

Wheeler: "I really couldn't hear you there. Could you please repeat that?"

Stava-Murray: "So the questions not only is it that the questions have to be the same for every... you have to follow the same process for every single police candidate. And so, yes, the questions absolutely have to be the same for every candidate throughout the cycle. So typically that's a two-year cycle."

Wheeler: "But that's not how we're reading it and that's not how the IML is reading it. I guess there's a lot..."

Stava-Murray: "Yeah. So I... I mean... and this is why we would have lawyers review the questions."

Wheeler: "How often do these questions change?"

Stava-Murray: "In my experience as a board member they were changed once in two years."

Wheeler: "Once every two years?"

Stava-Murray: "It was changed once in two years..."

Wheeler: "Once in two years."

Stava-Murray: "...and we weren't given any oversight in the process as the company... or as the entity that was hiring this polygraph examiner company. And it's to my understanding

40th Legislative Day

- almost the same polygraph exam company that's used across the State of Illinois. So it would be very easy to comply with."
- Wheeler: "Okay. I guess until there's clarity about what the opponents feel about this, since they are the people who have to implement this, I am struggling to be able to support it."
- Stava-Murray: "I'm not... when does the Illinois Municipal League ever conduct... I mean I was on the board. I'm just unclear on how they're involved in the oversight of the police hiring process?"
- Wheeler: "Is this Bill written just to apply directly to the hiring of, you know, the fire and police board situations you outlined or is it everyone hired by an entity serving on a subdivision of a political... or political subdivision of any of the state?"
- Stava-Murray: "This says that the law... that it is the intent of the Bill is to apply to hiring any... any State Government that's applying... that's using a polygraph exam. Which to my knowledge is just the Illinois State Police and the different police entities around."
- Wheeler: "Again, I'm sorry, Representative, I just can't hear what you're saying."
- Stava-Murray: "To my knowledge the only entities that use polygraph exams in the hiring process are the police."
- Wheeler: "Tell me where in the... in the Act this is a very... like you said, very short Act here. I don't see the restriction that a polygraph in this case only applies to hiring purposes?"
- Stava-Murray: "So is this what you're questioning? You're questioning the other usage of polygraphs exams then?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Wheeler: "Right. I mean to... to me..."

Stava-Murray: "Where the suspect consents?"

Wheeler: "I understand your very narrow version would apply to a set of questions you might use as a baseline over and over again. But I mean it's not withstanding any provision of the law to the contract, for every polygraph question submitted for the administration of a polygraph exam by a state agency or entity shall be screened by a legal... independent legal counsel to ensure compliance with legal... with the Illinois... with the Illinois and the Constitution of the United States in federal and state laws screening shall be paid for..."

Stava-Murray: "So what are the other usages of the polygraph that you heard that you are concerned about?"

Wheeler: "Again, what did you say? I can't hear you."

Stava-Murray: "So what were the examples of the polygraph usage that you have listed there?"

Wheeler: "I don't know. I'm not is there any other polygraphs...
this list applies to, I guess in my understanding, to any
element of polygraph used in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Davis: "Hold on Rep... excuse me would you all please keep the noise level down so that the Representative can hear?

Thank you."

Stava-Murray: "So the... the polygraph exam questions it seems in have one other utilization and they're used during questioning where an individual may not be forced to take a polygraph exam. And again, the Chicago FOP has assured me that in their usage of this... or the Chicago FOP said that they were neutral on this Bill. So if there were a problem

40th Legislative Day

- with that other I would think... I would think that the Chicago FOP would have surfaced that to me."
- Wheeler: "Well again... okay. Again, I just think that there's not enough clarity about whether this Bill is narrowly defined enough to address the issues that you bring up, which I understand."
- Stava-Murray: "I'm happy to talk to you about this if... if it passes tonight and we can... I'm happy to seek further clarity for you on this issue as it goes to the Senate."
- Wheeler: "Yeah. I... I understand. I appreciate that and unfortunately there's a vote on this right now, right? Unless you're going to pull it from the record?"
- Stava-Murray: "No, I'm not pulling it from the record."
- Wheeler: "Well then we're stuck the other way. So I appreciate the conversation and I look forward to having more of it. But at the same time, until I understand that part of the process, I have the urge that we don't support this measure yet. So vote 'no'."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Stava-Murray to close."
- Stava-Murray: "Thank you. This is a very simple Bill on a very simple issue. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2569 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
  And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ammons, Buckner,
  Costa Howard, Gong-Gershowitz, Lisa Hernandez, Mah, Ortiz,
  Slaughter, Thapedi, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 36 Members voting 'yes', 67 voting

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

'no', and 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, not having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1444, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1444, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hoffman."

- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This passed unanimously out of committee. I know of no opposition. It's an initiative of Southwestern Illinois Community College. It indicates that currently you can elect a secretary for the Board of Trustees to perform the secretarial duties. But this would also allow you to appoint a nonboard member to perform the secretarial duties. That's the current practice there. This would just codify it in law."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1444 pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Greenwood, Keicher, Mayfield, Stava-Murray, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this vote, 101 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mazzochi, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mazzochi: "I rose because I wanted to debate the last measure my button... my button was lit and it was not recognized."
- Speaker Davis: "When I went to vote, Representative, there was no name up here on my screen."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Mazzochi: "I pushed it."

Speaker Davis: "I would have recognized you."

Mazzochi: "I pushed it."

Speaker Davis: "Thank you. Representative Halbrook, for what reason do you rise?"

Halbrook: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to reflect that I wish to be recorded as a 'yes' vote on 423."

Speaker Davis: "The record shall so reflect. House Bill 3701, Representative Tarver. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3701, a Bill for an Act concerning juveniles. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Tarver."

Tarver: "Mr. Speaker, this is a cleanup Bill for the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice. It expedites the hiring process for hiring school personnel. It removes the requirement that the... that CMS verify licensure for individuals seeking educator related positions requiring licensure by the State Board of Education. Basically instead of having to go to CMS to review and then CMS to send it to ISBE it would allow ISBE to verify these licenses in and of itself. It also clarifies suspension of the IDJJ custody when an adult charge is pending in another jurisdiction for a juvenile."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise? Seeing no further discussion, Representative Tarver moves that House Bill 3701 pass. All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Cassidy,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Costa Howard, Harper, McCombie, Meyers-Martin, Wehrli, Welter, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Bill, 65 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2650, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2650, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Rita."

- Rita: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2650 is a Bill that requires the EPA, Illinois EPA, to adopt rules to increase the accessibility to set aside programs for their Water Revolving Fund. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Davis: "Seeing no questions... seeing no further debate, the question is, 'Shall the House pass House Bill 2650?' All those in vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Buckner, Keicher, Mazzochi, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 137, Representative Barbara Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 137, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. The Bill was read for a second time previously.

  No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Barbara Hernandez."
- Speaker Davis: "Representative Barbara Hernandez on House Floor Amendment #1."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So this Amendment will allow to expand the corrosion prevention bridge work to all state and local projects."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Barbara Hernandez moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. Representative Batinick? She moves for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 137, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Barbara Hernandez."

Hernandez, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, this will allow to expand corrosion prevention bridge work to all state and local projects. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Batinick, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Batinick: "I oppose. I'll keep the debate short."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Batinick: "So, to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Batinick: "My understanding of this Bill is this is going to severely tie the hands of government bodies and municipalities to get certain work done if they're... whether they're painting... doing something as big as painting a bridge as mentioned here or doing something as small as painting a fire hydrant. This... this is... I know it's late in the day and

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

we're rolling through some stuff but this is a bad Bill. Vote
'no'."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Barbara Hernandez to close."

Hernandez, B.: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 137 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? DeLuca, Flowers, Stava-Murray. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 70 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 256, Representative Guzzardi. Mr. Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 256, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was for a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 256, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Guzzardi."

Guzzardi: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Members. This Bill pertains to an exam called the edTPA. This is an exam that's given to student teacher candidates after they have completed their program in order to receive their licensure. There's a number of troubling aspects about this exam, but the one that we're focusing on today pertains to videotaping. So this exam has a video component. Requires these teacher candidates to

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

film hours of footage in the classroom with children in the room. We believe that this is an inappropriate requirement to place on student teacher candidates. And so, the Bill simply suggests that whatever test ought to be required, we don't want to remove testing, this is a different issue than one that we heard about earlier today involving the removal of tests. We don't want to remove testing from teachers. All we want to do is say that whatever tests we do require of teachers ought not require them to videotape students in the classroom. We've seen a lot of data privacy concerns. A lot of concerns about these videos of students getting out there into the world and being unsecured. So we want to make sure there are high standards for our teachers. But simply they don't have to be required to do this videotaping in the classroom. That's all the Bill does. It's a bipartisan Bill. I've worked closely with Members on the other side of the aisle on this issue. I look forward to an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Skillicorn, this Bill is on Short Debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Skillicorn: "I'm undecided but I'd like to ask the Sponsor some questions. I'll ask for Standard Debate."

Speaker Davis: "Standard Debate. Are you speaking in opposition or support?"

Skillicorn: "I'm undecided."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Skillicorn: "Representative, so I don't want to hammer this out.

It's late in the day. I have no... I have no problem dealing with standards... maybe making it easier to facilitate to get

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

more teachers in Illinois. Why is videotaping such a big deal that we need to eliminate this?"

Guzzardi: "Well I'll tell you, we've heard a lot of concerns about it. It's very disruptive to the student teacher training process. They have to spend a lot of time in the classroom getting this footage rather than actually learning how to become better teachers. They're spending all this time getting, preparing, editing this footage for this test. And the result of it, unfortunately, isn't that the video makes them any better of a teacher because they don't get any feedback on the video from Pearson, they just get a numerical score. So it's not helpful to them it's detrimental to their learning. And then the big problem is that these are student teacher candidates, they're not licensed teachers, and they don't all fully understand the rules around data privacy. So there are a lot of concerns... if you were to Google right now edTPA videos you'd find hundreds of these videos of kids in classrooms whose parents didn't sign off for their kids to be on YouTube. But because these teacher candidates aren't licensed teachers and they don't know the rules sometimes they post these things inappropriately and this data gets out. In an era where we're very concerned about biometrics and student video ... student data being made available, we want make sure that these teacher candidates aren't inappropriately required to film it."

Skillicorn: "So a hundred percent gotcha on the student privacy.

Who edits these videos?"

Guzzardi: "So the students do. The students record the videos, they edit... by students I mean the teacher candidates... the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

teacher candidates record the videos, they edit them. Oftentimes they'll send them around to friends and say, hey listen do you think this clip is better or this clip is better? So there's... there's sort of leakage in the data at that moment during the editing process."

Skillicorn: "So to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Skillicorn: "This very well might be a worthwhile thing but I know that lot of this might, you know, we're... we're politicians we might speak in front of a mirror so we can critique ourselves. We might watch a video of ourselves and critique ourselves. That still can be very valuable. So I'm not sure if this is what we really need to eliminate. I don't know if this is going to solve our teacher crisis but thank you for putting it forward. I don't know if this is the answer but I'll continue to hopefully find out more."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Wehrli, are you speaking in support or opposition?"

Wehrli: "Opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Wehrli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Wehrli: "So, Representative Guzzardi, down here words matter.

Your Bill mentions videotape. Would that be Super 8 Beta VHS?"

Guzzardi: "That's not the intent of the legislation,
Representative."

Wehrli: "But that's what the Bill says, that this prohibits videotaping."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Guzzardi: "I would be more than willing to amend the language to say video recording or recording of moving images, whatever language you think would address the... the most up to date technology. I'd be happy to make any changes you suggest."

Wehrli: "So are you aware that these standards also apply to National Board-certified teachers that they do this as well?"

Guzzardi: "So... so that's..."

Wehrli: "Does this Bill exempt them from this?"

Guzzardi: "I'm really glad you brought that up. It's a really important point. It actually speaks to Representative Skillicorn's point, too. So there are a lot of really legitimate and useful and good uses for videotaping in the classroom for teachers to improve their practice and to apply for things like National Board Certification. This Bill doesn't speak to any of those. This Bill recognizes that video is a really useful tool for teachers to get better. And it's important for things like higher levels of licensure like National Board Certification. This Bill only speaks to the test that is required to receive licensure. So in State Law we say you have to take a test in order to be a licensed teacher. I think that's a great thing. But that test, according to our Bill, cannot require a video component. That's the only piece we speak to."

Wehrli: "No, according to your Bill it says you can't videotape." Guzzardi: "I'm sorry. According to the Bill..."

Wehrli: "So are... are you aware that when these student teachers are instructed to take these videos that they're supposed to take down any identifying things that... first off they need to get consent from the students and they're supposed to remove

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

anything that say, you know, name the high school or name the junior high or anything like that or remove shirts, things like... are you aware of that?"

Guzzardi: "They are, yeah..."

Wehrli: "To make these as anonymous as possible."

Guzzardi: "They are, we understand that. But again, the... the facts of the case are that that often doesn't happen. And a simple Google on your computer would reveal that. And, unfortunately, the reason is that these are not folks who have been fully trained as teachers. Like most of these folks are in 12 week summer training programs. They do this filming in week 4 and week 5. So they're a month in to learning how to be a teacher. They don't know all the rules. And as the real world has borne out, they often misapply these rules."

Wehrli: "So do we have a teacher shortage right now?"

Guzzardi: "Oh it's my understanding we do. Yes, Sir."

Wehrli: "How does this Bill help... help that teacher shortage?"

Guzzardi: "Well I would say that the video component of this test..."

Wehrli: "Videotape."

Guzzardi: "The videotaping component of this test, if you prefer. The video component has... had a detrimental effect on passage rates. And in particular for teachers who do their student teacher training in communities of color. Because there is, unfortunately, implicit bias that sort of finds its way in to assessment on video. Where if you're just doing a paper and pen exam it's not there. But unfortunately, these videos create a higher fail rate for teachers who are doing their

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

practice in communities of color. So I think it has a strongly detrimental effect on our teacher shortage."

Wehrli: "I'm going to disagree because ISBE would have to completely rewrite the teacher testing criteria. You would absolutely eviscerate what teachers... student teachers have to go through in order to get certified as teachers. This is part of what they have to do. So..."

Guzzardi: "I... I think they can very easily do what many other states do, which is to find another exam that doesn't require a video."

Wehrli: "So I want... I want you to be fully aware that this Bill may cause a delay in hiring of teachers for the next two to three years, as ISBE rewrites the language. And by the way, hopefully they'll address the digital component of this."

Guzzardi: "No one has..."

Wehrli: "To the ... to the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

Wehrli: "This Bill is government overreach. It is poorly written.

It is... it's intent is to make it harder for teachers to become teachers. One of the most noble professions around is to be a teacher. What we all are here because we're grateful for those teachers. We should be doing things to make it easier for them to get their certification. This derails the process. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Davis: "Representative, does that put you in the opposition corner?"

Wehrli: "Strongly."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Reick, are you speaking in favor or opposed?"

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Reick: "I am speaking in support of the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Reick: "To the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "To the Bill."

"This Bill came to my attention by a lady who came into my legislative office in Woodstock who actually teaches student teachers. And she gave me some information that I found quite amazing about the curriculum itself. This videotape portion of the curriculum constitutes a fairly large portion of the training that these teachers undergo in order to determine their... their qualifications as a teacher. The problem that we have or they have is the fact that there is no spontaneity in the... in the recording of these teachers in the classroom. These teachers are taught by the people who are actually teaching them to go in to do the videotaping that this is scripted. They are very much under... they're being told do this in a scripted way. Don't do this in a way that a teacher would react to a child doing this or a child doing that or a ... or a circumstance coming up. They, for lack of a better description, they videotape themselves to the test. They're training to the test. They're not training to the fact that they become good teachers. And this... if this video is meant to characterize or give Pearson the kind of data that they need in order to determine whether this teacher is qualified to teach or not, they're going about it the wrong way. Because what's happening is is these teachers are scripting... are scripting their videotapes. There's absolutely no effect. There's no real benefit to what they're doing. So, you know, this is all about... this is all about the people who wrote the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

test. This is not about telling us how good a person will be in a classroom. I commend the Sponsor of the Bill for bringing this up. And I'm very grateful to the lady from my district who came in and told me about this because this Bill does not tell us the quality of a teacher. Those videos do nothing to indicate how good a person will be in a classroom. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. And what I would like to see is Pearson to go back to the drawing board and actually do some work on their... on their assessments instead of having this five minute video account to for about a third of what it is that they're using in terms to determine whether these people are qualified. This is a bad program. This is a good Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Scherer, are you arising in support or opposition?"

Scherer: "I rise in support."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Here is some things that I have heard from a variety of school districts. The administrators are very upset that the focus of this becomes a pure focus on the video portion rather than on actually learning how to teach during student teaching. Another one with the supervising teacher said that they had a student who just melted in a puddle they were so upset because the video equipment just kept breaking. It's an unnecessary burden on students when they're trying to student teach. And it has been successful for decades without that. If a state university doesn't feel that they need this then I don't know why some party from Massachusetts owned by Britain thinks

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

that they can come in and tell us that this is necessary. I have a personal experience. A child I taught in third grade was in hiding from an abusive father that was out on the East Coast. And they had an order of protection. And she kept hiding whenever a camera came out and just melted. And low and behold somehow he found her on the internet and I never saw her again after the last day of school that year. They had to move on to yet another state. The volume oftentimes doesn't work in the program they require you to use and then you have to write out the entire dialogue of what was said. Some of the student teachers need the special equipment and if they've already left their university they have no way to even get the equipment. If you're in a provisional year and you go to a parochial school they won't allow the testing to be done in a parochial school. So you have no access to students to even do this. And Pearson has got to either clean up their act or we need to find a different testing company to quit ripping off the State of Illinois. Thank you, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Crespo, we... we have now had three speak in favor of the Bill, for what reason do you rise?"

Crespo: "In opposition."

Speaker Davis: "Please proceed."

Crespo: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor... Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Crespo: "So, Representative, we talked earlier about the basic skills test, right?"

Guzzardi: "Yes."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Crespo: "The basic skills test is intended to measure basic skills?"

Guzzardi: "So the name says."

Crespo: "Yeah. There's a content test right?"

Guzzardi: "Yes."

Crespo: "What is the content test for?"

Guzzardi: "My understanding is they're intended to measure a teacher candidate's competency in different content areas."

Crespo: "Correct. What's the purpose of the edTPA?"

Guzzardi: "My understanding is that the purpose is to serve as a summit of assessment to determine whether teachers are prepared for their work in the classroom."

Crespo: "Yeah, just basically to... to find out a teacher performance. It's an assessment in teacher performance. And the purpose is to, one, see how they plan for instruction and assessment. It also takes into account instructing and engaging students in learning and assessing student learning. Do you... are you aware that the students who participate or the students who are part of that video, that the parents sign a waiver?"

Guzzardi: "Sure. Yeah."

Crespo: "And are you aware that the student teacher signs an agreement where they are agree that they're not going to post this on social media?"

Guzzardi: "I'm aware that they make that agreement, but, as I said, in the real world this is happening all the time."

Crespo: "I know... I know. But you are aware that they do sign agreement that they're not supposed to post it?"

Guzzardi: "Sure."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Crespo: "Okay. What's the pass rate on the edTPA?"

Guzzardi: "I don't know off the top of my head, you might though."

Crespo: "Ninety, ninety-two percent. How long has the program been in place?"

Guzzardi: "The edTPA?"

Crespo: "Yeah."

Guzzardi: "Again, I defer to your expertise in this area, Leader."

Crespo: "Since 20... 2015."

Guzzardi: "Since 2015? Okay."

Crespo: "We haven't heard too many complaints about the video component. What we've heard complaints about on the edTPA it's that it's too long."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Crespo: "And I know ISBE has talked to Pearson and they're trying to address that right now, see if they can shorten that a little bit. They've had complaints about maybe it's too costly, right? Three hundred dollars."

Guzzardi: "Sure."

Crespo: "Yeah. And I... I know Pearson does give out some fee waivers. And ISBE has talked to them about giving out additional fee waivers. That if there's a student teacher that agrees to teach at a Tier 1 school that maybe they should get a fee waiver."

Guzzardi: "Right."

Crespo: "So those are the concerns that've come up so far in the last three or four years. The videotaping piece has not been an issue."

Guzzardi: "I... I would tell you, Representative, that it... it's a concern that I've heard a lot about as I've worked on this

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

issue over the last couple of years. And I... I share your concern about these other areas. And so, it seems like maybe the time is right, given this video challenge and given these other challenges that you've mentioned, to revisit our contract with Pearson and to try to come up with an assessment that's going to meet our needs better."

Crespo: "Well the video component is a key piece. I think there's only one other company that provides teacher performance assessment that has the video component. So there's really only two in the market right now. But what you want to do is just get rid of the video piece and I think it adds value. I think this is a difference of opinion."

Guzzardi: "Sure. Sure."

Crespo: "And to the Bill. Again, this has only been in place three or four years. The complaints that we've heard and ISBE has heard about is basically has to do with the fact that it's too long and it's costly and they're trying to address that. The video piece has not really been... been an issue. There's some anecdotal stuff that we've heard from people. I get that, but I would actually consider voting 'no' on this for now. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Seeing no further debate, Representative Guzzardi to close."

Guzzardi: "Thank you. And thanks everyone for the questions. I just want to address a couple of things that have come up during the course of the debate. To the question of whether this is an impediment to teachers being able to get licensed in our state, I would say, the video component to this test is a huge impediment. And, yes, the passage rates are high

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

but a lot of the people who are not passing aren't passing because of this video component. And a lot of people simply aren't taking the test or completing the program because this video component is so burdensome. So I think that this video component is standing in the way of people getting licensed as teachers. So removing this component will help address our teacher shortage. And then I would also just say to the concerns that were just brought up by the previous speaker, I think that there are number of challenges with the edTPA. As we just heard, the cost, the duration, and also the amount of your student teaching time that gets sucked up into preparing for this video piece. It's a ton. And you talk to anybody who works with student teacher candidates and you'll find out that of the 12 week program during the summer they're spending maybe 2 whole weeks just getting this video right. That's time that these people are not learning how to become better teachers. It's time they're learning how to edit tiny, little clips and make sure that they look right for their test. There's something I neglected to mention which is that we have a broad coalition of people who support this. Including, I'll mention, the Statewide School Management Alliance and the Association of Regional School Superintendents. So the people who run our schools are telling us this video component doesn't work, please remove it from the program that licenses our teachers. So I believe that this is a good Bill. I believe that this Bill will encourage us to reconsider a problematic component of our teacher licensing process. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 256 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'.
And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Arroyo, Butler, Davidsmeyer, Flowers, Hammond, Mazzochi, Meier, Sosnowski, Walker, Welter. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 83 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 6 would require the Department of Public Health to establish women health clinics throughout the state to provide affordable health care for women. Now I took this Bill out of the record before because of the cost that was attached. And quite frankly, we do have Department of Public... Public Health in our communities. We have State Department of Public Health, we have County Department of Public Health, we have City Departments of Public Health. But they all are supposed to do basically the same thing. They... they're all are supposed to have an environment which is conducive to educate and... I'm sorry... they're all supposed to help educate and keep a healthy and safe Illinois. And sometimes some clinics are not as good as others. And so, what I've asked my colleague on the other side of the aisle, if he would trust me to pass this Bill out of the House over to the Senate. And

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

I promise to hold it there until he and I and a few others could work out what it is that we want our clinics and Department of Public Health to look like. Because a lot of them are outdated, need... they need new equipment, they need more money. And they are very important in a lot of communities where people do not have access to hospitals and doctors. And so, as a quality of care, I would appreciate that we make the oldest association in the health care profession, and that is the Illinois Department of Public Health. I would hope that we would be able to keep it, update it, expand it, and make it accessible for those people who do not have access to clinics and hospitals in their communities. And for those of us who live in the city and want to have health care in our community, these clinics are to be brought up to par. And I really would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Davidsmeyer, this Bill is on Short Debate, are you speaking in opposition?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes. Yes, Sir. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Davis: "She says she'll yield."

Davidsmeyer: "So, Mary, we've... we've had some good conversations this Session on multiple Bills."

Flowers: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "I still have... I still have concerns on this. I trust that... I trust your intent and I trust the direction that you want to go with this but I don't think we're there. This Bill, currently, still has over a billion dollar cost. And I know that you said that we're not going to move it until... until we figure it out in the Senate. But I trust you. I don't know what their intent is over in the Senate. And so, what I'm

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

going to ask you, once again, and we've done it before, can you pull it from the record? Let's have more discussions. We can talk about it tomorrow. I mean is it possible? If you feel the need to continue to run your Bill tomorrow we can run it again tomorrow. But I don't want to... I don't want to... because I want to help move this forward. I know your hearts in the right place and I know you want to do the right thing. But this Bill itself... like I said, I want you to have the opportunity to move this idea forward but as is, I don't think I can support it. So if we remove it from the record let's... let's talk a little bit more tonight. And then let's... let's figure if we can do something tomorrow."

Flowers: "Well, Representative, when you asked me to do it before.

I did it."

Davidsmever: "Yeah. Yes. Yeah."

Flowers: "And... and now we're at a deadline."

Davidsmeyer: "I understand. And I..."

Flowers: "And so, I'm merely asking you... I trusted you. You said take it out. And I did everything that you asked me to do and I'm still waiting. And according..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah, I agree. Yeah."

Flowers: "...and, you know, I don't know what that fiscal note, I don't know if that was real or not. Because according to our analysis at the time it says that the Illinois Department of Public Health is currently reviewing their position on this Bill. Now that is what's was on our analysis. So they didn't say 'yay'. They didn't say 'nay'. And I have spoken to the director since then about all of my Bills and she said that she was looking forward to working with me but she had just

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

started. And so, again, I'm asking you and I'm promising you if we would allow the Bill, if we can pass it out tonight. And let's have a conversation with the director to find out what it is that we can do. Because I need for you to remember that Senator Durbin and the Congresswoman had a hearing and had a meeting. And there will be appropriations coming for this specific issue. And I want us to be ready to receive the funds in order to prepare a better place for our moms and babies."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. You know, I go back and... and in committee and things like that I know there's plenty of time to work forward. We can control it after it gets out of the committee. So when you make a promise that you're going to hold it on Second and you're going to continue to work or something like that in a committee, we can still control it when it's in this Body. When it goes over there I don't have the relationships with... with individuals over there to trust them to not push it forward. What if somebody puts pressure on them to move something like this forward?"

Flowers: "No one..."

Davidsmeyer: "I have major concerns. At the end of the day, I can't vote for something that has a billion dollar cost associated with it. I... I want to figure out a way to do this. And I want to figure out a way to capture every federal dollar that we can possibly capture to provide services for... for people."

Flowers: "And you voted on that Bill. You voted on that Bill the other day to make sure that the Department of Public Health go after every single dollar."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Davidsmeyer: "Correct. Yeah."

Flowers: "Because last year... I want you to know monies lapse, monies that should be go... that should have gone to these places it lapsed."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Flowers: "And every penny should be going to help the people of the State of Illinois."

Davidsmeyer: "And that's... that's where we need to work with the department themselves. When federal money becomes available they need to come to us and say, hey, there's this federal money available but if we don't change this law we're not going to receive it. I... I don't know that this actually is geared directly toward the federal dollars. You know, I... I gotta..."

Flowers: "No, it's..."

Davidsmeyer: "...I've got a email here from the department that has four specific things that they're concerned about. The outside agency scope. It says, IDPH acts as a regulatory agency and does not provide any direct patient care. Number two, there's no funding mechanism. So right now, until the Federal Government comes forward to fully fund this, there's nothing... there's no way for the state to provide this, a billion dollars. It bypasses HFRSB, which is the Health Facilities and Services Review Board. Which we've dealt with on other things. Which we apparently did... did today already. And it also provides that duplication of services that we have already talked about with regards to the local County Public Health Departments."

Flowers: "That we help fund."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Davidsmeyer: "So I..."

Flowers: "That we help to fund."

Davidsmeyer: "We do help provide funding but if we required... if this Bill passes it requires the state to duplicate services. It requires the state to establish a separate organization to provide the service. I... I want to make sure..."

Flowers: "I will... Representative, I haven't seen... I didn't get the privilege of getting an email."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Flowers: "I don't know who the email is from."

Davidsmeyer: "I'd be happy... I'd be happy to share it with you.

And that's why I want us..."

Flowers: "Okay. Who is the email from? Who is the email from? And when was it sent?"

Davidsmeyer: "J.B. Meier the legislative liaison."

Flowers: "Okay."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. And Nick Florian, who's also a...."

Flowers: "No, no, no, he's from the Department of Human Services.

He's not from the Department of Public Health."

Davidsmeyer: "This one... this one's actually Nick Florian. Sorry from the IDPH. Sorry, my apologies. My apologies."

Flowers: "But, Representative, I will be more than happy to take...

the sentence that's probably concerning you, is the

department shall establish."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Flowers: "Okay. I will take that language out. I'll have that language removed in the Senate. But the services... the services that is supposed to be provided at the women's health clinic shall be offered at an affordable price and shall include,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

but not be limited to, the following. And currently the following is happening, but it's not at... the quality is not happening at all clinics. The annual women's health examination. Including Pap test, breast examination, pregnancy confirmation, prenatal care including ultrasound examination. And so, there's lots of things that should be included and it's not. And I'm asking you..."

Davidsmeyer: "There's... so really quick, this Bill I... it's well intentioned. Like I said, we've worked on a number of things this year together and I hope to continue that moving forward. This Bill does not contain specific... any specific quality control measures or anything of that sort. So I have grave concerns. I want to make sure... like I said, I want to make sure we collect every federal dollar. But until those programs are crafted we don't know how to craft the law here in Illinois to ensure that we claim those dollars."

Flowers: "We know that the money is coming. We do know that. And...
and we... we could craft it because we have... this is being
crafted every year. That's the reason why it wasn't done right
and the money was left on the table."

Davidsmeyer: "So... and I'm not trying to hurt anybody in this... in this building. I'm not trying to hurt anybody's feelings, but politicians make a lot of promises that never come to fruition. And I'm not saying that our Senators is doing that. And I'm not saying that... that anybody... any of our Congressmen are doing that. But at the end of the day until we see how it's formed, like this is a billion dollar cost..."

Flowers: "Representative. Representative."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Davidsmeyer: "...to the state of Illinois as it leaves. I'm not trying to be...."

Flowers: "No, no. Let me... let me just say this, please, okay? Last year... first of all, 10 years ago we passed legislation in regards to funding a deadly disease called Krabbe. It was... we funded that... we funded the Department of Public Health, gave them the money, and it was never implemented, never. And as a result, infants died and some that lived had a very poor quality of life. They had the money. They did absolutely nothing until January of last year. And it was only after we had a hearing and mandated that they do so."

Davidsmeyer: "So... so under Blagojevich and Quinn they didn't implement it but under Rauner they implemented it?"

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Davidsmeyer: "That's what you're telling me?"

Flowers: "Only after I had the hearing and..."

Davidsmeyer: "And I'm not trying to be political..."

Flowers: "No..."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm just saying that's the reality is they didn't implement it because they didn't want to."

Flowers: "...I'm not arguing the point because that's exactly... it was under Rauner. A few days before the end of the year did he implement the... the program."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Flowers: "You're absolutely right."

Davidsmeyer: "So..."

Flowers: "But my point to you..."

Davidsmeyer: "And that's... that's a separate issue."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Flowers: "...that it was funded 10 years prior but it wasn't implemented."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I will assure you... and I don't... I don't know Governor Pritzker that well, but I will assure you if there are federal dollars that are available for the programs you're specifically discussing that we will work hard on both sides of the aisle to get a Bill through here to ensure that we claim every single dollar. I think that this is incredibly premature based on the promises of elected officials."

Flowers: "I think it's long overdue, Sir. I don't think it's premature."

Davidsmeyer: "I understand."

Flowers: "I think people been waiting too long to have health care in their communities..."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I am saying as far the funding."

Flowers: "...and the quality of care."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm saying as far as the available funding. I'm not saying that we shouldn't be providing quality health care 'cause we should, right? We've had discussions. My wife's a labor and delivery nurse. She wants to make sure that patients are happy and healthy and that babies go home safe and sound. And... so at the end of the day, this is a billion dollar cost to the State of Illinois as it leaves this..."

Flowers: "You keep saying a billion dollars but that was just an estimate that you got from..."

Davidsmeyer: "The department."

Flowers: "...from the department."

Davidsmeyer: "That's the fiscal note. Yeah."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Flowers: "And... and the director... the director was not there and I don't know where... and you cannot attest to that billion dollars being an actual amount. You cannot attest to that."
- Davidsmeyer: "So... so the director... the director wouldn't be the person who goes through and figures out what the cost is, it would be the rank and file people that have been in the department for a number of years that would go through and try to figure out what the actual cost is. I... I don't want to continue to debate this because I think that we are... we are at an impasse. The... we should do everything that we can possibly do to provide these services but..."
- Flowers: "Well then you should join me, Representative, because I kept my word to you, Sir."
- Davidsmeyer: "I know you did and I... I couldn't draft an Amendment quick enough to figure out how to make this work. I mean we're dealing with a fairly complex..."
- Flowers: "But that's what you said that you were going to do and I said that I was going to try and get someone and I'm still waiting. And so, as a result of the time constraints..."
- Davidsmeyer: "I've... I've got two Bills that are my personal Bills that I wasn't able to craft an Amendment quick enough to get it through deadline. So I understand where we're at. I'm not trying to push those and force those through. I think we need to be thoughtful about this process to ensure that..."
- Flowers: "I'm very thoughtful about it, Sir. This is a life and death situation for a lot of communities."
- Davidsmeyer: "I... I know you do a lot of thinking and I know you care a lot about it and... and like I said, I want to see the

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

tape from those discussions that you had with the mothers and the medical professionals and all those things."

Flowers: "Those were two hearings and those were all medical professions..."

Davidsmeyer: "I'm looking forward to listening to those on my many long drives back and forth to and from Springfield. But at this point, the state cannot afford to try to implement a billion dollar program when the Governor's already said that we're \$3 billion in the hole for this year, that the \$15 minimum wage is going to cost another billion dollars when it's fully implemented. I don't think we can add another fifth billion dollars. That's another \$5 billion over the revenue..."

Flowers: "Representative, with all due respect... Representative..."

Davidsmeyer: "...that we have and that doesn't include any other programs or anything that we've passed just in the past month.

I... I want to work with you, I promise."

Flowers: "Do you... do you know how much it costs for every time an infant and mother die? Do you know how much money we spend on investigating that death? When we could have been putting it into some type of lifesaving organization like clinics in the Department of Public Health. Do you know how much money it costs that family to lose a loved one? Do you know..."

Davidsmeyer: "It costs more than money. I... I agree."

Flowers: "Do you know that every hospital that caused the death of a mother and infant the insurance companies pay that hospital bill?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah."

Flowers: "And so, my point to you... and Medicaid paid for the death of that mother. And so, the only thing that I'm trying to do

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

is make sure that they live. And if we're going to pay out some money we are... this is a cost savings, this is a cost savings because it's less... less expensive to go to a clinic, a public health clinic than it is to go to a hospital. And then if they don't have their Medicaid card or their redetermination these... these moms are pregnant or they have infants that need access to health care. They don't have time to wait until..."

Davidsmeyer: "Let me... let me just... at this point I'm not ready to support this. I don't... I don't think the Body's ready to support this. But I will say that I will continue to personally work with you on this because I think... I think it's a good goal and it's a good direction, we just have to figure out how to best implement it. So at this time, I will not be able to support your Bill. I... I don't think the billion... billion dollar cost is reasonable. But I will, I promise, I will work with you to try to figure out a way to get this done."

Flowers: "Well, Representative, thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "So I appreciate the opportunity to work with you, and I hope we can work together in the future. Thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "We've had one speaker in favor one opposed.

Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really appreciate all the support that you've given me in regards to my maternal and infant mortality Bills. And I wish that you would continue to do so. And I will keep my word to the Gentleman. I will not have this Bill moved in the Senate until

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

we get an actual fact in regards to what it will cost for the clinics. And I'm not asking for clinics to be built, but there's some clinics that needs to be updated. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Andrade, Carroll, Cassidy, Crespo, D'Amico, DeLuca, Edly-Allen, Feigenholtz, Kifowit, Martwick, Mussman, Scherer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Would you please put this on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Davis: "This Bill will be on Postponed Consideration.

Representative Kalish is recognized for a point of personal privilege."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I know Kalish: we've... we've all been here for many hours, but this is an important... this is an important point of personal privilege on behalf of my community. I believe we are all deeply concerned about the recent outbreak of measles and the threat it poses communities around the country, which is why I wanted to share this statement issued today by Agudath Israel of America, for that reason countless rabbinical figures and leaders including Rabbis and the Agudath Israel and doctors serving these communities have repeatedly encouraged vaccination in the strongest possible terms. Indeed the overwhelming majority of children enrolled in our schools are vaccinated. Governmental records indicate that vaccination rate in Yeshivats are... exceed 96 percent. And

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

vaccination rates in certain schools and preschoolers may be lower vaccination is the clear societal norm in my Orthodox Jewish community. Agudath Israel views with equal alarm something else that has spread along with this disease, infectious hatred. Our public discourse is debased when individuals and media outlets point the finger of blame for the spread of measles squarely and sometimes viciously at the Ultra-Orthodox community. Social media comments have been particularly appalling in this regard. This is a time to come together and to collaborate and meet... to meet a challenge. There is no excuse to use a public health issue, an outbreak we are suffering from, as a platform for which to spew poisonous anti-Semitic rhetoric. The motive behind this hatred becomes readily apparent in light of statistics evidencing that acute Orthodox Jewish outbreak areas have vaccination rates rivaling those of many other municipalities. There may be reasons why, despite the high percentages of immunization, our communities are more susceptible to an outbreak of measles. Epidemiologists have chronicled how international travel by Orthodox Jews to outbreak areas, closely interrelated Orthodox social networks, and high number of our children at ages most susceptible to highly contagious disease are key factors in the spread of diseases of this kind. These are all reasons it is imperative to build on the Orthodox communities already high vaccination rate and not to spread a contagion of hate. I ask for this Body to join me in eradicating these dual scourges, disease and hate, and demand that both demand our immediate response. Thank you."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

- Speaker Davis: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 283, offered by Representative Lilly. House Resolution 285, offered by Representative Kifowit. House Resolution 286, offered by Representative Butler. And House Resolution 288, offered by Representative Unes."
- Speaker Davis: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution #63, offered by Representative Harris. Be it
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, April 12, 2019, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 30, 2019, or until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 30, 2019, or until the call of the President."
- Speaker Davis: "Leader Harris moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Representative Butler, for what reason do you rise?"
- Butler: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to congratulate you on a marathon day up there. Good job, my friend."
- Speaker Davis: "Thank you. And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Harris moves that the House stand

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Adjourned until Friday, April 12 at the hour of 8:30 a.m., 8:30 a.m. All those in favor say 'yes'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the House stands adjourned.

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3831, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid, offered by Representative Bailey. House Bill 3832, offered Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 10, offered by Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 24, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 25, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 29, offered by Representative Mason, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 37, offered by Representative Walsh, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 54, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 61, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Senate Bill 68, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 75, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 112, offered by Representative Stava-Murray, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 122, offered by Representative Meyers-Martin a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 145, offered by Representative Villanueva, a Bill for an Act concerning

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

elections. Senate Bill 147, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 161, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 162, offered by Representative Keicher, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 168, offered by Representative Severin, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 209, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 218, offered Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Senate Bill 222, offered by Representative Mah, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 397, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 399, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 449, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 453, offered by Representative Villanueva, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 455, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 456, offered Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 457, offered by Representative West, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 516, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 637, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 946, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 996, offered by Leader Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

1134, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Bill 1213, offered Senate Representative Stuart, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1223, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1226, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1249, offered Representative Reick, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1255, offered by Representative Meyers-Martin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1272, offered by Representative Welter, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1287, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1294, offered by Representative Costa Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1317, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1425, offered by Representative Stava-Murray, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 1449, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1467, offered by Representative Stava-Murray, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1473, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1510, offered by Representative Moeller, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1524, offered Representative Ammons, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 1530, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1548, offered by Representative Welter, a Bill for an Act concerning

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

revenue. Senate Bill 1552, offered by Representative Walsh, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1557, offered by Representative Villa, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1568, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1569, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1580, offered by Representative Wehrli, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1588, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning harassment. Senate Bill 1591, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1597, offered Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1601, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1602, offered by Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1624, offered by Representative Andrade, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 1628, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 1639, offered Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1641, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1642, offered by Representative Ramirez, a Bill for an Act 1665, concerning education. Senate Bill offered Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1671, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 1696, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1702, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 1711, offered by Representative Costa Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 1719, offered by Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 1726, offered by Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 1735, offered by Representative Ramirez, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1746, offered by Representative Greenwood, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1755, offered by Representative McSweeney, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1756, offered Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1778, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1780, offered by Representative Didech, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1796, offered by Representative Morgan, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1798, offered by Representative Edly-Allen, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1805, offered by Representative Halpin, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 1809, offered by Representative Ugaste, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1813, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1828, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 18... 1829, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1831, offered Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Senate Bill 1852, offered by Leader Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 1854, offered by Leader Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 1862, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1872, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1899, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1909, offered by Representative Greenwood, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 1911, offered by Representative McDermed, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 1919, offered by Representative Walker, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1932, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1937, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1952, offered Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1970, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 1981, offered by Representative Bennett, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1988, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1993, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1995, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1996, offered by Representative Buckner, a Bill for an Act concerning public benefits. Senate Bill 2037, offered Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

government. Senate Bill 2040, offered by Representative Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 2052, offered by Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2060, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2067, Representative Caulkins, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2085, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2090, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 2097, offered Representative West, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2124, offered by Representative Caulkins, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2128, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2135, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2146, offered by Representative Slaughter, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #31, offered Representative Skillicorn. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend the Illinois Constitution in Article VIII by adding Section 5 as follows:

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

#### ARTICLE VIII

#### FINANCE

#### SECTION 5. PROHIBITED EXPENDITURES; PENSION SUBSIDIES

Public funds shall not be expended for the purpose of a subsidy or bailout of a pension fund or retirement system for members of the General Assembly or officers under Section 1 of Article V.

#### SCHEDULE

Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. This was First Reading in full of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #31. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 939, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 940, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 941, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 942, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 943, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 944, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 945, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 946, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 947, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 948, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 949, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 950, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 951, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 952, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 953, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 954, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Bill 955, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 956, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 957, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 958, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 959, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 960, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 961, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 962, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 963, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 964, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 965, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 966, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 967, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 968, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 969, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 970, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 971, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 972, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 973, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 974, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 975, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 976, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 977, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 978, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 979, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 980, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 981, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

concerning State government. House Bill 982, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 983, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 984, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 985, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 986, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 987, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 988, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 989, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 990, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 991, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 992, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 993, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 994, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 995, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 996, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 997, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 998, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 999, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1000, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1001, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1002, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1003, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1004, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1005, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1006, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1007, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1008, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

1009, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1010, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1011, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1012, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1013, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1014, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1015, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1016, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1017, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1018, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1019, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1020, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1021, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1022, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1023, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1024, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1025, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1026, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1027, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1028, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1029, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1030, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1031, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1032, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1033, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1034, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1035, a Bill for

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1036, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1037, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1038, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1039, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1040, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1041, a Bill for an Act concerning local... criminal law. House Bill 1042, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1043, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1044, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1045, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1046, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1047, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1048, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1049, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1050, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1051, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1052, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1053, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1054, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1055, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1056, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1057, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1058, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1059, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1060, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1061, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1062, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1063, a Bill for an Act making appropriations.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

House	Bill	1064,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1065,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1066,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1067,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1068,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1069,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1070,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1071,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1072,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1073,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1074,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1075,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1076,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1077,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1078,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1079,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1080,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1081,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1082,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1083,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1084,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1085,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1086,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1087,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1088,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1089,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1090,	a	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1091,	а	Bill	for	an	Act	making	appropriations.
House	Bill	1092,	a E	Bill f	or a	n Ac	ct ma	king ap	propriations."

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1093, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1094, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1095, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1096, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1097, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1098, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1099, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1100, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1101, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1102, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1103, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1104, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1105, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1106, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1107, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1108, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1109, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1110, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1111, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1112, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1113, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1114, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1116, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1117, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1118, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1119, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1120, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1121, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1122, a Bill for an Act concerning

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

transportation. House Bill 1123, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1124, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1125, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1126, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1127, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1128, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1129, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1130, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1131, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1132, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1133, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1134, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1135, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1136, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1137, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1138, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1139, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1140, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1141, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 1142, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 1143, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 1144, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 1145, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 1146, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 1147, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 1148, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 1149, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation.

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

House Bill 1150, a Bill for an Act in relation to budget implementation. House Bill 1151, a Bill for an Act in relation to appropriations. House Bill 1152, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1153, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1154, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1155, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1156, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1157, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1158, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1159, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1160, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1161, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1162, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1163, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1164, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1165, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1166, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1167, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1168, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1169, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1170, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1171, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1172, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1173, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1174, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1175, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 1176, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1177, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1178, a Bill for an Act concerning

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

transportation. House Bill 1179, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1180, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1181, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1182, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1183, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1184, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1185, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. House Bill 1186, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1187, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1188, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1189, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1190, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 1191, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 1192, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 1193, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 1194, a Bill for an Act concerning agriculture. House Bill 1195, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 1196, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 1197, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 1198, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 1199, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 1200, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 1201, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1202, a Bill for Act concerning safety. House Bill 1203, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1204, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1205, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1206, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1207, a Bill for Act concerning safety. House Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

concerning safety. House Bill 1209, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1210, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1211, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1212, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1213, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1214, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1215, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1216, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1217, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1218, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1219, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1220, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1221, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1222, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1223, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1224, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1225, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1226, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1227, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1228, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1229, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1230, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1231, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1232, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1233, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1234, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1235, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1237, a Bill for an Act making

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

appropriations. House Bill 1238, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1239, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1240, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1241, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1242, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1243, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1244, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1245, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1246, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1247, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1248, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1249, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1250, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1251, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1252, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1253, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1254, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1255, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1256, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1257, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1258, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1259, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1260, a Bill for Act an concerning gaming. House Bill 1261, a Bill for Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1262, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1263, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1264, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1265, a Bill for an Act 1266, a Bill concerning gaming. House Bill for Act concerning gaming. House Bill 1267, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

concerning	gaming.	Нои	ıse	Вi	11	12	68,	a	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1269	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1270	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1271	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1272	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1273	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1274	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1275	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1276	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1277	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1278	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1279	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1280	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	ll	1281	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1282	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1283	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1284	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1285	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1286	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1287	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1288	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1289	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1290	,	а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulatio	n.	Hou	se	Bil	11	1291	,	a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	gaming.	Нои	ıse	Bi	11	12	92,	а	E	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	gaming.	Нои	ıse	Bi	11	12	93,	a	E	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	liquor.	Нои	ıse	Вi	11	12	94,	a	E	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	liquor.	Нои	ıse	Вi	11	12	95,	a	E	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	liquor.	Нои	ıse	Вi	11	12	96,	а	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

concerning liquor. House Bill 1297, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 1298, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 1299, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1300, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1301, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1302, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1303, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1304, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1305, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1306, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1307, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1308, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1309, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1310, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1311, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1312, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1313, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 1314, a Bill for an... House Bill 1314, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 1315, a Bill for an Act concerning urban problems. House Bill 1316, a Bill for an Act concerning urban problems. House Bill 1317, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. House Bill 1318, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1319, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1320, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1321, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1323, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1324, a Bill for an Act concerning alternative dispute resolution. House Bill 1325,

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

a Bill for an Act concerning alternative dispute resolution. House Bill 1326, a Bill for an Act concerning notices. House Bill 1327, a Bill for an Act concerning notices. House Bill 1328, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1329, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1330, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1331, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1332, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1333, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1334, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1335, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1336, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1337, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1338, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1339, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1340, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1341, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1343, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 1344, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1345, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1346, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1347, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1349, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1350, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1351, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1352, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1353, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1354, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

concerning transportation. House Bill 1355, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1356, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1357, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1358, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1359, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1360, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1360, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1361, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1362, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1363, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1363, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1364, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1365, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1366, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1367, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1368, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1369, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1370, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1371, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1372, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1373, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1374, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1375, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1376, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1377, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1378, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1379, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1380, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1381, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1382, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1383, a Bill for an Act

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

concerning	regulation.		House		Bill		1384,		а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.		House		Bil	1	1385,		а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	1	1386,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	1	1387,		а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	1	1388,		а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	l	1389,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	l	1390,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	l	1391,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	l	1392,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	l	1393,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	l	1394,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	l	1395,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	l	1396,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	l	1397,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.		House		Bill		1398,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.		House		Bill		1399,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.		House		Bill		1400,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation.		House		Bill		1401,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	1	1402,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	١.	Hous	е	Bil	1	1403,		a	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	regulation	1.	Hous	е	Bil	1	1404,		а	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	finance.	Нοι	use	Вi	111	1	405,	a	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	finance.	Нοι	use	Вi	111	1	406,	а	E	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	finance.	Нοι	use	Вi	111	1	407,	a	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	finance.	Нοι	use	Вi	111	1	408,	а	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	finance.	Нοι	use	Вi	111	1	409,	а	E	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	finance.	Нοι	use	Вi	111	1	410,	а	E	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	finance.	Нοι	use	Вi	111	1	411,	a	Ε	Bill	for	an	Act
concerning	finance.	Нοι	use	Вi	111	1	412,	a	E	Bill	for	an	Act

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

concerning finance. House Bill 1413, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1414, a Bill for Act concerning finance. House Bill 1415, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1416, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1417, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1419, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 1420, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1421, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1422, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1423, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1424, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1425, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1426, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1428, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1429, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1430, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1431, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1432, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1433, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1434, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1435, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1436, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 1437, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of these House Bills. They will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Correction of a Second Reading previously read tonight. House Bill 1151, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of

40th Legislative Day

4/11/2019

this House Bill. This will still be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."